

# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 10904—making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10904, with Mr. BURLISON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to bring to the House this bill making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and for the Labor Department. For 12 years I have served as chairman and for 16 years as a member of this subcommittee.

First, I wish to take time to express my gratitude to the members of this subcommittee. I do not know of a harder working subcommittee in the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], is the ranking Democratic member of the committee. He has been one of the best supporters of

health programs I know of in the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], is one of the finest Americans and one of the best men I have ever seen on the Appropriations Committee. I, for one, am deeply sorry he is not going to stand for reelection this fall. The House of Representatives certainly is going to lose one of its most valued Members.

On the Republican side we have two most able young men and two of the hardest working men in the House on the committee: The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking Republican member of the committee, has put in long hours this year to bring this bill to the floor. He agrees with me and other members of the committee that if we work a little longer hours we can complete our business and adjourn by the end of July as we are supposed to.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCHELL] has also put in long and tiresome hours. These gentlemen have given me their full cooperation, and as a result we bring to you today a bill appropriating more than \$5 billion in total, but a report that is unanimous. For the 12 years since I have been chairman of this subcommittee we have had unanimous reports.

And I could not let this opportunity pass without mentioning the clerk of our committee, Robert M. Moyer. We feel that Bob Moyer is the best clerk of any committee in the Congress. He is a hard-working, dependable, and very capable assistant to all of us. We have come to lean on his ability and I must say that in all the years of his service he has never yet let us down.

Before outlining the bill I wish to take notice of the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I do not know of any two men in the Capitol who over the years have saved more money for the taxpayers of the country than the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Missouri. I am sorry to hear that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not going to stand for reelection. He served with me 4 years on this subcommittee as ranking Republican member, and even though we did not agree on all things, when the end of deliberations came and the compromises were made we still had a unanimous report. I think the gentleman from New York is one of the finest Americans I ever worked with. He has been a dedicated member of the Appropriations Committee and deserves the everlasting gratitude of the people of this country for his tireless work in this regard.

While we will all miss the gentleman from New York, we are fortunate that the man who will take his place as the ranking Republican member of the full committee is also a man of great stature and one with long experience in dealing with appropriations. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has served with distinction on many of the appropria-

tions subcommittees. He served on this Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for 4 years. As far as the programs of health, and education, and welfare are concerned, he was always a staunch supporter. He was a big help to us on the subcommittee and I am sure that he will be an able leader of the other party in the new position he will assume on our full committee next year.

The bill before us today is not much different from previous bills dealing with these departments for the past several years.

Let us take up first the Labor Department. This is an old established Department. It has been in operation since 1913. We have substantially allowed the budget in most cases but have reduced many of the items by relatively small amounts. The total reduction in the requests for direct appropriations is \$8,223,000, all of these are covered in the report on the bill.

In my opinion Secretary Goldberg is doing an outstanding job in a very difficult position. In the short time he has been in office he has shown real progress in developing the very important programs of the Department of Labor. I think he will go down in history as one of the greatest Secretaries of Labor we have ever had.

Then, in regard to the other Department, in general this has been a most progressive and constructive year for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In my judgment Secretary Ribicoff has provided HEW with imaginative leadership. He has presented a broad legislative program of new and exciting dimensions. Last year Congress accepted his proposals in the fields of social security expansion, aid to children of unemployed parents, community health services, water pollution control, and a pioneer attack on juvenile delinquency. I am confident that this year substantial achievements will follow the fine start of last year.

Within the Department new directions are evident in a number of fields, most notably in Secretary Ribicoff's program for reform and revision of the Nation's welfare laws. Launching a full-scale review of welfare laws and regulations months before the Nation ever heard of Newburgh, N.Y., Ribicoff has moved by executive action to eliminate abuses and develop more constructive programs to help get people off the relief rolls. The legislative recommendations of the Secretary, recently passed by the House, will advance both efforts substantially.

To my mind HEW represents the most difficult assignment in the domestic field. Its programs are diverse and often controversial. Its first full year under the leadership of our former colleague, Abe Ribicoff, has been marked by new ideas and steady progress—in short, a most successful year.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have made a total cut of \$114 million. The large cut is in the public assistance program. This cut was made because \$97,900,000 of it is not yet authorized by law. As a result we could not appropriate these funds.

The balance of the cut was on the basis of information indicating that factors had changed since the budget was prepared. For instance, the estimate submitted in January of the supplemental funds needed for 1952 was reduced by about 40 percent when it was actually submitted in February.

The Bureau of the Budget made some significant cuts in this budget. Three of the most significant cuts were in areas in which Members of Congress are very deeply interested: Two are in the area of aid to federally impacted school districts; one for the maintenance and operation of schools and the other for the construction of schools.

Last year Congress extended this act. We felt, as the Appropriations Committee, that since the Congress had acted and had established a definite formula, we ought to appropriate 100 percent of what these districts were entitled to. As a result, we show an increase of \$50 million for operation and maintenance of these schools and about \$8 million for the construction of these schools, a total of over \$58 million we have put back into this particular bill.

Another sizable cut of over \$35 million made by the Bureau of the Budget was in the area of hospital construction. I do not know of a better program that has been operated by the Federal Government than the so-called Hill-Burton hospital construction program. We did not raise this as much as some of us wanted to. We raised the budget about \$12 million to bring it to the total of what this House passed 1 year ago. It is way below what the Senate passed, but we brought it up to what the House passed a year ago, which is a considerable improvement over the budget but still less than many Members would like to see appropriated.

I will place in the RECORD a fine letter I have just received from the American Hospital Association:

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,  
March 26, 1962.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: The American Hospital Association has been vitally interested in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act since its very beginning. We have continued through the years to follow the program closely and to urge the appropriations of funds adequate to carry out the provisions of the program.

There seems to us to be no question as to the continued need of the program in view of the rapid increase in population, continuing changes in medical practice and the constant obsolescence of existing hospitals. The program has accomplished much in the years since its inception. The expenditure of Federal funds has served a specific purpose intended and that was to stimulate and assist the States and local areas within the States to meet their needs. We believe the program has served as a fine demonstration of Federal-State relationships, and it has in fact served as a model for other programs.

Throughout the years, this association has urged the Congress to appropriate the full amount of the authorization. We were very pleased that last year the Congress appropriated the highest figure in the history of

the program. We noted, however, that the administration authorized an expenditure of \$50 million less than the appropriation. At this time, we wish to urge an appropriation of the amount specified in H.R. 10904.

I would like to express the very great appreciation of this association and of the hospitals of the country for the fine leadership and support you and the members of your committee have always given to this program.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH WILLIAMSON,  
Associate Director, American Hospital Association.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. Chairman, the other large increase is in the National Institutes of Health. We have increased these appropriations by \$60,400,000 on the basis of the facts that were presented to us.

The appropriation for the National Institutes of Health is, as every Member of this House well knows, one of the most important items to come before the Congress each year. Perhaps I should say that it is the most important item. Nothing affects each citizen more directly and more constantly than his health.

There are, of course, many people and many private, State and Federal agencies that are concerned in one way or another with the prevention of disease and accidents, the restoration of health and the rehabilitation of the disabled. Some of these programs, as they concern the Federal Government, I have already discussed; the bill now before the House includes appropriations for several of them. But none of these programs is so fundamental as the medical research conducted and supported by the National Institutes of Health.

Almost everything that the medical profession can do to prevent illness, to cure the sick and to relieve those who cannot yet be cured is the result of past research. The record of achievement of medical research in years gone by is written large in the statistics on longer life expectancy, the decline in infant and maternal deaths, and the virtual disappearance of the epidemics of so many infectious diseases. Diphtheria, scarlet fever, smallpox, whooping cough, and tuberculosis were common household words and dreaded household fears when most of us were young. Today, as the result of research, many young doctors have never seen a case of some of these diseases.

And medical research continues to add to the list. Rocky Mountain spotted fever, once a constant threat in many rural areas, is no longer the fatal disease it was a decade or so ago. Polio, whose sudden and unpredictable outbreaks in scattered areas throughout the country used to strike terror into the hearts of parents each summer, is no longer a major threat. In the near future apprehensive little children will not even have to face the mildly uncomfortable polio vaccine injections. A few months ago the National Institutes of Health, which has among its vital functions the responsibility for insuring the safety, purity, and potency of all biological products used in the prevention and cure of human disease, licensed the pro-

duction of oral vaccines for two of the three types of polio virus. NIH witnesses told the committee that an oral vaccine for the third type of polio is also about to be approved as safe and effective.

More such heartening developments lie immediately ahead. A measles vaccine is already in initial production and is now being given large-scale trials in five metropolitan areas. There are now nearly three-quarters of a million reported cases of measles in this country each year and many more that are not reported. I know that measles is not generally regarded as a serious disease except when it strikes adults. In fact, we all know of mothers who have sent their children to play with friends who have measles so that they might catch it and thus build up a future immunity. But this is a dangerous practice. Measles can lead to complications which can result in deafness or mental retardation or even death. Each year more children die of measles than of polio—I think it is something like twice as many. An effective measles vaccine will therefore be another great advance toward the elimination of the major infectious diseases in which medical research has already been so remarkably successful.

Such a vaccine can make an even greater contribution to world health. In many countries where nutrition is bad and public sanitation is poor, measles has a very high death rate. For this reason National Institutes of Health has undertaken a large-scale experimental vaccination program in west Africa to test the effectiveness of a more virulent but faster acting live virus vaccine in stamping out this disease. Such collaborative international projects pay dividends not only in terms of health but in terms of international good will of which we can use a good deal more in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

It also looks as though medical research will at last be able to do something about the common cold. During the past few years, the rapidly expanding knowledge of viruses has shown that colds are not one disease but many. We cannot, therefore, expect a single, simple, cold cure but the committee learned during the hearings on the bill that the way is now clear for developing a vaccine that will be effective against the viruses that cause about 60 percent of the most severe respiratory illness in children and which also confine many adults to bed.

I should like to remind the House—I have quoted this figure before—that the complex of diseases which we call colds and flu cost this country \$2 billion a year in lost time and lost productivity. A vaccine which is effective against part of these illnesses is worth much more than the cost of the years of research which are now making it possible not only because of the acute discomfort it will prevent but because of the extra dollars of national income it will produce.

I dislike putting dollar signs on the value of medical research. None of us sets a price on our health or the health

of our families and I object to measuring the need for Federal support of medical research in terms of the money it might save. But the sheer economic loss inflicted on this country by illness, disability, and premature death is so great that it completely overshadows the investment the Federal Government is making in medical research. No comprehensive estimate has ever been made of the total national dollar loss due to disease but it clearly runs into many billions a year in loss of income, loss of taxes, and direct out-of-pocket cost to care for the sick and the disabled. The loss of goods and services due to cancer has been estimated at \$12 billion a year. Arthritis and rheumatism lose us \$2 billion of potential income and \$250 million in taxes. Tax losses due to cerebral palsy are estimated as \$300 million. One extra year of good health for every victim of arteriosclerosis would bring \$150 million rolling into the Treasury. The Veterans' Administration alone spends nearly \$1 billion in care and compensation for veterans with neuropsychiatric problems. State and local mental hospitals cost another \$1 billion. The debit items in such a fiscal account are staggering and depressing.

But this, as I have said, is not the way I look at the need for medical research. My conviction that it is the best investment any decent, humane government can make stems from an accounting of the pain, the tears, and the anguish caused by disease and disability and early death. And this, I am certain, is how the voters and taxpayers of Rhode Island and of every other State in the Union measure the value of the programs administered by the National Institutes of Health.

We can all be proud—immensely proud—that these programs have made the United States the unchallenged leader in medical research. This, at least, is one area of science in which we are not second to some other country. This is one area of science in which we do not have to appropriate large sums of money in order to try to catch up with somebody.

We have to appropriate a large sum of money—and I think the \$840,800,000 provided in this bill for the National Institutes of Health is a large sum of money—only because, as a nation, we are interested in the welfare and happiness and health of each of our citizens and it takes a large sum of money to meet the challenge of disease, to pursue the many promising research opportunities that lie before us and to take advantage of skills of the many fine scientists who are willing to dedicate their lives to biomedical investigations.

The only yardstick against which we need to measure this appropriation is the magnitude of the tasks that await to be done if we are to press the attack on the dread diseases with all the vigor of which this country is capable.

The committee, during its extensive hearings, heard much about recent accomplishments in each of the disease areas and the very important basic biological sciences represented by the seven Institutes and the Division of General

Medical Sciences. These reports were extremely encouraging and fully justified the faith in these programs which the committee and the Congress have so often expressed. But the committee was actually more concerned with the sober reports of the vast array of biological phenomena and human diseases about which man's knowledge is pitifully small compared to his ignorance. The appropriation which the committee strongly and unanimously recommends is not in payment of past achievements but to make possible vital further work.

We must devote whatever resources are required to the pursuit of viral research in cancer. We must develop methods for the earlier and surer diagnosis of cancer which, even with the still limited treatments available, can save many lives. We must continue the already fruitful search for more effective and safer drugs for combating cancer, for controlling blood pressure, for helping arthritic, diabetic, and mentally disturbed patients and for a host of other diseases. We must determine the true role of diet in heart disease which causes 54 percent of all deaths in the United States. We must find the causes, and hopefully the cures, for mental retardation and other congenital diseases. We must make more vigorous attacks on deafness, blindness, and the whole complex of neurological diseases. We must explore the new field of autoimmunity, or the reaction of an individual to substance within his own body, which is now thought to be responsible for rheumatoid arthritis, many allergies, and perhaps other unsuspected diseases.

I could go on and recite evidence of great progress and evidence of even greater research needs in each of the disease areas supported by the various Institutes. I could talk at length about the more fundamental need for research in the basic biological sciences where the missing keys to many disease problems will ultimately be found. Not only the official witnesses but the many eminent scientists and physicians whom the committee heard testified extensively on all these points.

The transcript of the hearings, which covers more than 2,000 pages and includes many special reports requested by the committee, is an impressive and well-documented record of our national achievement in biomedical research as well as a challenging and well-informed assessment of the problems and opportunities that lie ahead.

One of the problems to which the committee has given very serious study is the future availability of highly qualified investigators to maintain the momentum of the national medical research effort. In order that this important question might be thoroughly and thoughtfully considered in the light of all the available facts, the committee last year requested the National Institutes of Health to submit during this year's hearings a comprehensive report on the estimated national requirements for medical research manpower in 1970 and a projection of the necessary output to meet this requirement.

The report which NIH submitted in response to this request has been printed as a separate volume of the hearings. It is an important document which provides a sound base for the future planning of the NIH research training and fellowship programs. It is necessarily a long document and I shall not attempt to summarize it but I would strongly urge every Member of Congress—and every citizen concerned with the future of biomedical research and our higher education problems—to read it.

The main facts which emerge from this study are that our present corps of a little over 40,000 biomedical research personnel must be expanded to more than 75,000 by 1970 if the pace of this research is not to be seriously slowed down by the lack of competent and well-trained professional workers. This means that this country must produce between 4,000 and 45,000 biomedical scientists in the next 8 years to provide the additional numbers that will be needed as well as replacements for those who will retire, die or be diverted into other work. In other words, we must have an average annual output of 5,000 which is almost 50 percent greater than the average output of 3,500 a year during the past 8 years. To meet this goal will require a major national effort for which the universities and professional schools, which must provide the training, will need Federal assistance. Without such Federal assistance the job cannot be done at a time when all our better educational institutions are already under the strain of trying to meet the growing general demand for higher education. Fortunately, and largely through the foresight of the Congress which has in past years insisted on expanding the NIH research training programs, the necessary administrative machinery for a broader national program in support of biomedical research training already exists.

In a supplemental statement, also submitted at the request of the committee, the NIH described the modifications in its training programs which would be required to meet the needs that emerged from the assessment of future manpower requirements. The main points, with which the committee fully agrees, are summarized in the committee report on the bill as follows:

1. The attraction into medical research of a greater number of men and women with an interest in research who already have an M.D. or Ph. D. degree and can therefore be most readily made available, by appropriate scientific training, to the research manpower pool;
2. The expansion of predoctoral fellowship and training programs in the biological, physical, and behavioral sciences;
3. The more sharply focused use of training funds in the clinical area for the development of clinical scientists as opposed to the dilution of these programs by preoccupation with the requirements of formal certifying agencies concerned largely with clinical practice;
4. Providing—as a parallel program to the foregoing but with longer-range objectives—an opportunity for particularly competent postbaccalaureate students to acquire, while in medical school, a truly scientific training, it being fully recognized that such a program must be designed to strengthen the

medical school and not deter it from its larger responsibility for producing highly qualified practitioners.

The committee has included in its recommendations approximately \$175 million for training grants and fellowships. This is about \$30 million more than the amount requested in the President's budget and will permit NIH to make an immediate start on expanding these programs so vital for the future.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that an immediate start is essential to the success of this program. It normally takes at least 6 years of clinical experience and postdoctoral research training after a man receives his M.D. degree before he becomes a fully fledged independent clinical investigator. To produce a qualified Ph. D. investigator in one of the clinical sciences takes about 7 years from the bachelor's degree. Clearly we must start at once to train the people who will come into the biomedical research pool in the late 1960's. Those who are needed earlier will have to be drawn from existing M.D.'s and Ph. D.'s by making immediately available to them the postdoctoral research training and research experience which will qualify them to carry on independent research projects.

The committee has not attempted to deal with the larger problem highlighted by the manpower report because this lies outside the scope of an appropriation bill. This is our urgent national need for the means to produce a greater number of M.D.'s and Ph. D.'s to satisfy not only the demand for medical research manpower but the competing demands of other important national programs for competent scientists and the already acute need for more practicing physicians, dentists and other health personnel to bring the fruits of our outstanding medical research directly to bear on the health problems of our people. The committee would like to point out, however, that this is a question to which the Congress must, at the appropriate time, also address itself.

The committee has for some time been concerned about the lag in bringing immediately applicable research results into practical use by physicians in the diagnosis and treatment of disease. This, of course, is the ultimate purpose of medical research.

The difficulties in communicating research results to practitioners are not due to any reticence on the part of scientists. Every scientist readily agrees that a research project is not complete until its results are made known. He is not only willing to publish his findings, he is eager to do so because his standing in the scientific community and his chances for promotion in the institution in which he works are greatly enhanced by an impressive list of published papers.

Part of the problem is due to the fact that most of these papers contribute pieces of the jigsaw puzzle of our understanding of a disease or physiological process but do not have enough of the picture on them to do the practitioner any immediate good. They are of importance to other research scientists working on the puzzle but not to the

physician who must have the whole picture before he can use it.

Another aspect of the problem is that most of our physicians are too busy to keep up with the journals to which they subscribe. They are too far from well-stocked libraries which they might consult when special problems arise. Too many of them are too complacent about their ability to deal with the illnesses they encounter to spend the time and energy to continue their professional educations after they have set up their practice.

The committee recognizes these difficulties but nevertheless feels that the medical community can do much more than it is now doing to overcome them and to make certain that research results are turned to practical account as soon as it is possible to do so. The Public Health Service has a responsibility to take the lead in this matter; and, I am glad to say, has now indicated a willingness to do something about it.

In response to its request for a report from NIH on the communication problem, the committee received reports not only from NIH but from the Bureau of State Services, which is the Public Health Service's principal contact with the medical community throughout the country, and from the National Library of Medicine, which has a clear and important role in the field of communications. The Surgeon-General told the committee that these three reports should be regarded as parts of a Service-wide report. We were disappointed, however, to receive no general recommendations or an outline of a PHS plan for dealing with the problem.

The report on this bill places the Public Health Service on notice that the House will expect it to include specific proposals for dealing with communication in the health sciences in its program plans for the next fiscal year. I hope that these plans will take into careful consideration the need to upgrade and extend this country's medical libraries, most of which are inadequate and of which there are far too few to serve the needs of physicians throughout the country. I hope that the Service will also thoroughly explore all the devices that may be helpful in encouraging and enabling practicing physicians to continue their professional education throughout their professional career. The pace of research is now so great that professional obsolescence is becoming a serious matter. Plans for training the thousands of additional research scientists and practitioners we shall need by 1970 must be paralleled by vigorous plans for retooling and sharpening the skills of those we already have.

The rapid growth of the NIH grant-support programs which the Congress has by its appropriation actions made possible, has inevitably created some administrative problems and has exposed NIH to a greater risk of having its support abused than was the case when the programs were small and each grant could be more closely watched. The committee has been well aware of this danger and has during the past 5 or 6 years instigated several reviews of NIH

administrative practices either by committee staff or by the General Accounting Office. As is inevitable in so large an operation, each of these investigations found some minor managerial faults which could be, and were, quickly corrected. The general conclusion in each case, however, was that the administration of the NIH programs reflected conscientious stewardship of public funds combined with remarkable effectiveness of the programs in achieving the purposes for which they were designed.

We must, I think, expect some unreasonable criticism as medical research becomes more involved in the environmental and social sciences. There is a great and urgent need for research in these fields as it becomes more and more apparent that certain diseases are not wholly organic in origin or cannot be successfully treated without regard to environmental and social factors. Preliminary research in these areas will, for example, frequently involve animals and the scientist concerned may not think it inappropriate or odd to identify his project with a title that invites ribald misinterpretation. Similarly, some investigations into human behavior—which obviously can have profound effects on both our physical and our mental health—will sometimes involve activities about which our society has widely accepted taboos. These will also be fair game for unthinking critics who do not share the scientist's willingness to view man as he is in an effort to understand why he behaves—physically, mentally, and emotionally—as he does.

We can, I think, have confidence in the excellent grant review system which NIH has set up and in the high caliber and sharp intelligence of the eminent men and women who comprise its scientific study sections and the various National Advisory Councils. These well-informed groups do not recommend approval of research projects in whose scientific merit and practical value they do not have complete confidence. And I suspect that in many instances they see a little further ahead than the rest of us in judging the potential usefulness of a piece of research. I cannot help wondering what the popular reaction would have been 20 years ago if a Federal agency had made a grant for research into the feasibility of space flight or sending a rocket to the moon.

The bill before you includes appropriations for NIH totaling \$840,800,000 which is \$60,400,000 more than the amount requested and \$102,465,000 more than the amount appropriated for 1962.

The increase reflects the considered judgment of the committee of the minimum amount required to maintain the momentum of our national biomedical research and research training programs. In arriving at this judgment, the committee took into consideration the recommendations of the professional scientific staff responsible for these programs, the advice of the many eminent private witnesses who testified at the hearings, and the committee's own detailed examination of the progress and prospects of each of the programs.



The sum recommended is a modest one. It is some \$14 million less than the amount requested by NIH as necessary to fund the meritorious and promising research proposals it foresees for the coming fiscal year. In the opinion of the committee it will, however, provide adequate support for on-going programs and provide funds to give some further impetus in crucially important areas both in research and in the training of investigators for the future.

There are only two or three other smaller increases. We recommend \$1 million over the budget for air pollution and the same for water pollution.

#### AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

The committee is impressed with the seriousness of the air pollution problem. In addition to the extensive economic damage, which amounts to \$7.5 billion annually, there is real concern over the effects on man's health. Increasing deaths from lung cancer plague the Nation, and evidence has been presented that this is linked with air pollution. Serious respiratory illnesses are increasing, such as emphysema and asthma. Minor respiratory illnesses, causing absence from work and much of the discomfort of man, appear to be influenced by air pollutants. Man is not the only living thing afflicted, either. Cattle are sickened and die from air pollutants, food crops are killed or otherwise seriously affected, and trees, flowers, and shrubs are poisoned. Every bit of evidence seems to show that this problem and its sad effects will increase as our population, urbanization, industrialization, and technological civilization increase and expand. This problem cannot be solved in a year or two; only further research can provide the answers to help prevent an increasingly serious situation.

The Public Health Service's summary of its 6 years of activity demonstrates a commendable vigor in attacking and assessing the problem. Photochemical smog, once thought peculiar to southern California, has been found in many American cities; lead, a very toxic hazard, has been shown to be found in community air and this is related to its use in gasoline in automobiles—its presence in the blood of residents of these communities is of real concern; a serious and fatal episode has been shown to have occurred in New York City causing over 200 deaths as a result of air pollution. Even more significantly, researchers have produced lung cancers in animals, as a result, in part, of breathing polluted air.

Much yet needs to be done—more research on unsolved problems is vitally necessary. At the same time, the committee feels that use and application of existing knowledge is equally vital. The program of the Service has not been sufficiently comprehensive to provide the guidance and assistance necessary to accomplish desirable control.

The President, in his recent message on program for protection of consumer interests, has again expressed his concern in regard to air pollution and indicated action the Department should take in regard to automotive exhaust emissions. The committee agrees and has increased the budget by \$1 million

with the intention that a major portion of it be used for more research in this field.

This committee has for years prodded the Department and indicated its dissatisfaction with the petroleum and automobile industry in not taking a more active interest and in not doing more work on this very important problem. A little more has been done in the last 2 or 3 years, but especially these two major industries should be doing a lot more.

One has to go no further than to walk from the Capitol to the House Office Building to be well aware of the obnoxious fumes and smoke that pour out from the buses in our Capital City. There is no question as to their being obnoxious; how dangerous they are no one now knows. We should know more about the danger and we should certainly do more to control such a public nuisance.

The Committee notes that the exhaust afterburners for cars presently advocated as a solution to this urgent problem are costly and will require complicated systems of inspection and maintenance, costing the car owner substantial sums. We believe that more effort should be expended toward the development of more efficient engine design which would decrease emissions from automobiles. The Committee endorses the President's action to direct the Department to work with the automobile industry but, as mentioned above, also believes the automobile industry is doing far too little in attempting to solve this problem.

#### WATER SUPPLY AND POLLUTION CONTROL

An imposing group of witnesses have appeared before my committee in support of a more aggressive effort to control water pollution. They have pointed out problems throughout the breadth and length of the land.

Here are a few illustrations which have been called to my attention:

Pollution threatens the destruction of shellfish and game fish in Puget Sound, the Columbia River, and other streams in the Pacific Northwest.

The death of ducks and other game birds in the wildlife refuges of the Klamath River of northern California and southern Oregon has been caused by pollution.

The municipal water supplies as well as the industrial development of the Colorado River Basin are threatened by industrial wastes and the salts leached from the soil.

During the past 2 years the joint Federal-State studies supported under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act demonstrate that this pollution—which threatens to stunt the development of so large an area of the country—can be controlled.

Water pollution from pesticides and insecticides is widespread.

Studies in Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana have revealed that chlorinated hydrocarbon and organic phosphorus compounds are carried into water courses after their application to crops. The toxic materials persist in water for a long period of time and actually pass

through our water treatment plants. Numerous fish kills throughout the land have been attributed to insecticides or pesticides entering the water through accidental spills or after application to crops.

For the calendar year of 1961, a total of 411 reports were received from 45 States, showing 15 million fish were killed. River mileages affected were 1,686, in addition to 51 miles of lake and bay shore and 5,967 acres of lakes, reservoirs, and bays.

Industrial wastes accounted for 44 percent of the known sources, as compared with 39 percent during 1960.

Agricultural poisons were again second, with 21 percent.

The waters of the Great Lakes, a priceless natural resource, are threatened by the discharge of industrial and municipal wastes from communities along their shores. Flushing action continually carries away pollution in streams, but in lakes pollution continues to accumulate. The action is gradual and insidious, but once the quality of the water is destroyed through the accumulation of pollutants, any remedial effort would be extremely expensive and take many years to accomplish. There is no assurance when the water quality can be restored if it is allowed to deteriorate and its value is destroyed through unabated pollution.

The waters in the Upper Ohio River Basin in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio and Kentucky are seriously affected by acid mine drainage. Much of the pollution is from inactive and abandoned coal mines and, therefore, takes on the character of a natural pollution problem similar to that of the salt in the Arkansas and Red River Basins. Results of preliminary studies are optimistic. A combination of control measures coupled with the provision of storage for flow regulation for quality control in Federal reservoirs could restore the beneficial uses of these waters. A large investment is required for effective control of acid mine drainage. Improvement in the water quality of a chronically depressed area would do much to solve the economic ills of the region.

More and more water will be required to support the population growth and industrial development of gigantic metropolitan complexes along the east coast of the Nation. Water pollution generated by the same growth and development will make it more and more difficult to provide water of the quality needed. The outbreaks of infectious hepatitis attributed to shellfish, grown in polluted areas of Raritan Bay, the ground water pollution problems of Long Island, the problem associated with water supply and waste disposal of the lower estuary of the Delaware River below Trenton, N.J., and the pollution of the Potomac and the Chesapeake Bay are but a few of the manifestations of water pollution attributed to the enormous growth on the east coast.

New pollutants present another complicating situation. Prior to 1940, city sewage was mostly natural organic material, household waste with its concentration of germs. Even industrial waste was composed mostly of natural organic

materials. Today, on the other hand, metropolitan and industrial wastes include increasing amounts of new kinds of contaminants, such as synthetic organic chemicals and radioactive materials. The volumes of these complex wastes are spiraling upward. Many of the new contaminants persist for long periods, and to a considerable extent, are not removed by conventional sewage and water treatment techniques.

We have much to learn about the behavior of the new substances finding their way into our streams, their effects on public health, aquatic life, and municipal and industrial supplies. The question of their toxicity adds to the age-old problem of enteric disease. The problems of water pollution are broadening to include a whole new array of pollutants.

In spite of these manifestations of water pollution, never was the stage better set for a constructive program. Public attention has been sharply focused in recent months on water pollution and what it means in our everyday lives. The National Conference on Water Pollution brought together interests from every walk of life. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, after 2 years of nationwide hearings and intensive study of water problems, did much to define the objectives for a comprehensive course of action.

After 5 years of experience, Public Law 660 was strengthened by the recent amendments signed by President Kennedy on July 20, 1961, to provide the best legislative basis for a water pollution control program that the country has ever had.

This appropriation request will weld the elements of public interest and legislative authority in a more dynamic action program. The budget will provide for regional laboratories located at strategic points throughout the country to provide resources to deal with problems where they are. These laboratories will promote research and training activities and provide a base of action for State, interstate, and Federal agencies cooperating to eliminate water pollution.

In addition to the field laboratories, two specialized facilities are needed to deal with the problems of aquatic life in fresh and marine waters. Municipal, industrial, and land drainage wastes consume large amounts of oxygen, drastically alter the physical and chemical water environment and are toxic to fish and other wildlife.

The effects of pollution on aquatic life are becoming critical. There is ample evidence of this in the increasing number and severity of fish kills, the elimination or reduction of salmon, shad, and other anadromous fish runs, the decreasing area suitable for sport and commercial fishing and the increasing stretches of streams and lake and coastal areas that are becoming "deserts" for beneficial aquatic life. All this at a time when our needs for recreational waters as well as municipal and industrial waters are increasing at a logarithmic rate.

A principal objective at these facilities would be to establish water quality cri-

teria for protecting fish and other aquatic life. These criteria are sorely needed for an effective program to restore and maintain an adequate recreational and commercial fishery resource. In this regard it is important that the suppression of pollution goes far beyond the mere elimination of fish kills. It is necessary to establish criteria for a healthy physical and chemical water environment that will permit the propagation and growth of aquatic life as well as bare survival.

In the actual number of fish killed, agricultural poisons were higher than industrial wastes—accounting for 5.6 million, as compared with 2.9 million.

We must never forget that this same water environment that is killing these fish is the source of drinking water for 100 million Americans.

With the country's dramatically growing power to produce we must have an equally growing power to reuse the country's water—for our cities, industries, and farms, and recreational activities. Clean water is the one essential and common denominator for them all.

For St. Elizabeths Hospital we raised the appropriation back to what they asked the Bureau of the Budget for, namely an increase of \$358,000.

This is a unanimous report, and I hope it will receive favorable consideration by the House today.

On the overall bill we cut out all funds for Civil Defense because those requests are now going to one subcommittee. We cut out all forward financing, that is funds for the fiscal year 1964. We cut out all requests for funds that were not authorized by law. The bill is not as large as I would like it, myself. I think we ought to spend more money in some of these areas, for instance environmental health, in medical research, and in other areas in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where I think we ought to be doing more than we are doing at this time. But this is the democratic way of arriving at these figures. Some on the other side of the aisle thought we were spending too much. As a result, we come here with a compromise.

We have asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare this year to put a little more emphasis on some of the problems involving mental retardation, people suffering from speech and hearing defects, hard of hearing and deafness, hemophilia, and other areas that have not been given the same consideration as heart, cancer, mental health, and all of the other larger programs in the Public Health Service.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it has been a pleasure to serve on this committee with the chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the other members of the committee. I know that the chairman of this committee has worked long hours in hearings and studying the details of this bill. He has intimate and detailed knowledge of every phase of this bill. Many of the programs are

programs that he has initiated. I know the chairman must take pleasure in the great work he has done and is doing in improving the health, education, and welfare of the people of this country. I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman from Rhode Island recalls that, I believe, it was when this bill was before his committee a year or so ago, I appeared together with the vice president of the University of Michigan, Dr. Sawyer, with respect to the problem of administering research grants made to the university or some of its departments.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. MEADER. I just wanted to inquire of the gentleman whether any further consideration had been given to the 15-percent limitation on indirect cost.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am glad the gentleman has asked the question. I remember when he appeared before the committee a year ago asking that these costs be raised to 25 percent. Many Members of the Congress have spoken to the committee this year.

When the National Institutes of Health first made grants for research, they allowed nothing for overhead costs. Then, for a few years, the allowance was limited by administrative regulation to 8 percent. On July 1, 1955, this limitation was raised to 15 percent. Then, in 1956, the NIH proposed to increase the allowance to 25 percent which was estimated to be sufficient to cover full overhead costs for a large percentage of medical schools and other institutions. It was at this point that congressional action was taken to halt further increases by placing the 15-percent limitation in Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

Our committee has observed that when the limitation was much less than it is today, the demand for grant funds on the part of medical schools and institutions consistently exceeded the available funds. Since the limitation has been 15 percent, the demand has continued to consistently exceed the availability of funds even though there has been a very substantial increase in these funds every year—from \$34 million in 1955 to \$431 million in the current fiscal year, 1962. Thus, it is obvious that the recipient institutions feel that the benefits to them outweigh the relatively small cost of bearing about half of the indirect expenses.

It is universally recognized that no medical school could function efficiently without a research program. It is also recognized that without Federal grants a good research program would be virtually impossible. It is further recognized that medical schools and other institutions participating in this program make an invaluable contribution to the medical research program of the Federal Government.

As a general proposition, it has been a longstanding policy of our Federal Government to require some matching of Federal grant funds used for the mutual benefit of Federal and non-Federal programs. One does not need to look outside of this particular bill to find many examples—the hospital construction program under the Hill-Burton Act; health research facilities construction grants; the library services grants; vocational education grants; cooperative research in education; grants to States for support of vocational rehabilitation services; grants for research and demonstrations in vocational rehabilitation; and cooperative research or demonstration projects in social security, to mention some of them. Under the research grant program of NIH, the required matching, if we assume the average indirect costs are 35 percent, is less than \$1 of non-Federal funds to \$5 of Federal funds.

On the other hand, we are faced with a very serious practical difficulty. I am fully aware of and have on many occasions publicly expressed my deep concern about the financial difficulties of the medical schools. I think this clearly presents a national problem of such magnitude that a straightforward program of Federal assistance is definitely warranted. In my opinion, this would be a much better solution to this financial problem than would a substantial further subsidy through Federal payments tied to research grants.

This discussion of overhead allowances would not be complete without commenting on the practices of nongovernmental grantors. Their grant programs are not nearly as large as those of the Federal Government, but are certainly important to the overall research effort of this Nation.

The current indirect cost rate allowed by the American Cancer Society is up to but not exceeding 25 percent of total direct costs. This rate was recently established by action of the board of directors of the society. The committee has been informed that several members of the board believe this rate to be excessive and are opposed to any further increase in the rate. The American Heart Association allows a maximum of 10 percent of total direct costs. The Ford Foundation has varying allowances for indirect expenses. Data available to the committee indicate that this rate varies from no reimbursement to 15 percent of total direct cost. The Russell Sage Foundation allows 8 percent of total direct costs as an allowance for indirect costs.

It must be admitted, for it is an obvious fact, that in the past this committee has not dealt uniformly with this problem. Some agencies of the Federal Government allow 100 percent of calculated indirect costs, others pay full indirect costs in some instances and negotiate a lesser amount in other instances, the National Science Foundation allows a flat 20 percent, and the agencies for which appropriations are made in the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill allow a flat 15 percent which is the limitation imposed by the language of the bill.

Considerable attention has been called to these discrepancies during the past year. The committee has had a study made to gather in one place the basic facts concerning procedures employed to determine indirect costs, and the policies for reimbursing the grantees, applied by both Federal and non-Federal granting agencies. The report of this study was submitted to the committee less than 1 month ago. The committee as a whole and the various subcommittees having responsibilities in this area are giving this matter serious and intensive consideration with the view to financing indirect costs on a uniform and equitable basis. Pending the outcome of these further studies the committee has retained the 15-percent limitation in this bill.

We hope that by next year some overall formula for the entire Government will be adopted. In the meantime, we hope that some relief will be given to these institutions which you spoke of.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman for the initiative which his committee has taken to restore 100-percent entitlements under Public Laws 874 and 815. Many of these school districts have had trouble each year endeavoring to anticipate the amount that they would actually receive, because for several years we have appropriated, initially, less than the full amount.

Mr. Chairman, I think all school districts will appreciate the initiative of the Congress to solve this problem.

Mr. FOGARTY. I might say to the gentleman that that was done by unanimous vote in the committee.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for the fine work he has done in connection with this bill. I am particularly interested in seeing that the cancer research appropriation was increased somewhat this year.

Mr. Chairman, cancer is the scourge of mankind, and has been for centuries. Until about 1900 it was treated in the same way as it was treated in the sixth century. One out of every five families will be affected by it, and one out of eight will die of it. I think in light of these circumstances it is most important that we give a sizable appropriation to this form of research.

Mr. FOGARTY. I know of the gentleman's work with the American Cancer Society in the State of New York, and I welcome his support and thank him for favoring this item.

Mr. DOOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. DOOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee for placing back in the bill the funds for the impacted school districts.

Mr. Chairman, I have several school districts in my own congressional district which are dependent upon these funds.

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we bring before the House the 1963 Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriations bill, and a report from our committee, which is in disagreement in several major respects from the budget request which was submitted by President Kennedy.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas in the 1963 budget, which was submitted to this Congress as a balanced budget, which I believe the Congress should become a little more familiar with. The 1963 budget submission by this administration in many areas is a phony submission. If you look at the particular bill which we have before us today, you will note there have been net reductions made, in the committee, of \$114 million from the budget submission made by the President of the United States. At the same time there were increases which this committee made which I feel sure the majority of the Members of the Congress would want made in this bill.

In submitting the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1963, the President of the United States cut back the program for impact aid for schools, both in the construction area and in the direct-operation area. It was the decision of the President of the United States, even after the Congress passed a bill extending this program for 2 years, that these particular programs in construction and in general aid for impacted school areas should be funded at only 81 percent of the level that the Congress had established in the authorization bill passed just last year.

I personally opposed certain sections of that authorization bill, and was 1 of 30 Members of the House of Representatives who raised objection to that bill and did not support it because of the formula used to pay aid to the area surrounding the District of Columbia. I did not believe that this formula was fair and equitable. But I believe that once the Congress acted upon legislation extending this impact aid program for another 2 years, after the President of the United States signed this bill last year, it was incumbent upon him to live up to the commitment which he made to these school districts. For that reason our committee unanimously recommends appropriations above the budget in this area of impacted school aid in the amount of some \$58 million in order to provide for 100 percent entitlement for fiscal year 1963. This is one addition we made, to live up to the commitment

which was made by the Congress of the United States, and to live up to a commitment which the President of the United States, I believe, made when he signed this bill and did not veto it last year when it was submitted to him and placed upon his desk.

Another area where an increase was made in this bill and which we feel was necessary was in the area of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. We have heard a lot of lipservice from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the President about the problem which faces us in the area of hospital care and medical care, but one of the prime needs in this country today is space in hospitals and nursing homes. In this area we in the Congress have accepted our responsibilities for a good many years. What do we find in this budget submitted by the President of the United States? A cut in the amount of money available for medical facilities such as nursing homes and hospitals under the Hill-Burton program. A program which is a Federal-State partnership program is at stake, a program which has been accepted by each of the 50 States on a partnership basis. Yet this is the area in this particular appropriation bill in which the President of the United States has decided to use the cutting ax—in the area of hospital construction, in the area of making more beds available so that the people of the United States can have the facilities which are necessary in this year of 1963 and as we face the future. It is false economy in this bill, and certainly the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives, should not place its stamp of approval upon this kind of budget reduction.

We have heard a lot of talk in the last year and a half about the importance of training workers, the importance of training because of the advances which have been made in automation, the importance of training because of new techniques being used in industry. The facts show that throughout America new records are being established for help-wanted ads in our many newspapers. These job opportunities are for trained and semiskilled workers.

The type of job opening available today requires special skill. We find that although the administration has been sending up a lot of messages in this particular area, in 1962 the programs of vocational rehabilitation in the Department of HEW and apprenticeship and training in the Department of Labor, were among the first places funds appropriated by Congress were withheld.

We received a message just this last week from the President of the United States in which he talked about the great drive that had to go forward in the United States today to protect the consumer. He talked a great deal about how increased efforts had to be made by the Food and Drug Administration, and that speech made headlines all over the United States. All we have to do today is to look at the 1962 appropriations, approved by the Congress of the United States in both the House and the U.S. Senate, and we find here that

the President of the United States and his administration are giving only lip-service to the activities of the Food and Drug Administration.

The President froze over \$300,000 of the funds appropriated by the Congress for this agency in fiscal year 1962.

Mr. Chairman, I could go through this bill item by item showing the Members of the House of Representatives how there has been great lipservice given by the New Frontier to these programs, but in actual performance the New Frontier is scoring just about zero. I will include with my remarks later today a table setting forth the actions of the executive branch on reserves for 1962.

We have here a budget for the Food and Drug Administration which has been agreed upon in our committee. It is my hope that this budget request, when it is approved by the Congress, will not run into the same kind of whim wham that we ran into in the last budget review by the administration when the funds which were made available were not used to carry on the very effective and important program which we already have to protect the citizens and consumers of this country. We do not need new laws, we had better follow through on those we already have.

It is necessary for us to go forward with a review of the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and I was pleased that the Committee on Government Operations plans to initiate hearings in this area this coming week. I believe a good review of this program will be helpful to the entire program. I commend the Committee on Government Operations for going forward with this investigation.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Calling the gentleman's attention to page 11 of the committee report accompanying the legislation, I note the reference to "\$3,200,000 to equip the Communicable Disease Center Facility for which funds were appropriated last year." Does this refer to the center in Atlanta, Ga.?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes; that is the center in Atlanta, Ga. This amount is for equipment to complete the facilities for which we appropriated construction funds last year and the year before.

Mr. MacGREGOR. It is my understanding, if the gentleman will yield further, that a fundamental part of the tubercular research is carried out at the present time in a tuberculosis research center located here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. LAIRD. Part of the activity is carried on here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. MacGREGOR. It is also my understanding that originally it was proposed to move this facility, along with its personnel, some time in 1964, but that just recently there had been a tentative decision to move in June of this year. Is the committee familiar with that situation?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, we are familiar with the general situation. I think this decision has been approved by the Surgeon General, but not by the Secretary of

Health, Education, and Welfare as of this date.

Mr. MacGREGOR. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like the Record to show that the Glen Lake Sanatorium located in Hennepin County, Minn., has been a participant for approximately 10 years in the coordinated effort of the tuberculosis research center here in Washington, with the aim and object of ultimately eliminating tuberculosis as a communicable disease in our country. The work of this sanatorium is known personally to me, and it is of a very high character. Research work has been conducted for some time at this sanatorium in connection with the operation of certain drugs on control groups; the work is a fine example of applied clinical research and is designed to keep tuberculosis at a low level and in a latent stage.

I have been disturbed by the fact that almost 90 percent of the more than 100 people in the tuberculosis research center here, when recently questioned as to their willingness to move to Atlanta, Ga., indicated that they would not move. There is a fear on the part of the people administering this program at the Glen Lake Sanatorium and elsewhere, that this program would be fatally interrupted if there is a precipitate move from Washington to Georgia, that it would decimate the most vital part of the program—the people who run it.

I should like further to advise the gentleman that Dr. John Porterfield, the Deputy Surgeon General, assured me that before there was any move of this tuberculosis research center from Washington to Georgia, we could be certain that the personnel in Georgia were adequately trained, or the personnel moving from here had agreed to go, so that there would be no interruption in this program.

I should like to say, in my opinion, this is a matter of vital importance not only to the Glen Lake Tuberculosis Sanatorium in my district but to the 20 or 25 tuberculosis sanitariums throughout the country that are working in cooperation with the research center here to try to stamp out this, one of the most vicious of our communicable diseases.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I will be glad to look into this. He called this matter to my attention last week. We had some discussion about it at that time. It was my understanding when we checked on this that the move had not been approved finally as yet. We will certainly look into the matter. We appreciate all the information and help the gentleman has given us.

Mr. MacGREGOR. It is my understanding that the matter is under reconsideration. I will feel a lot easier if I know the gentleman from Wisconsin and the committee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, will watch to see that there is no diminution in the wonderful work being carried on with the \$6 million being appropriated thus far for tuberculosis research. I thank the gentleman, and I should like to commend him for his comments here with



respect to the diversion of funds allocated by this Congress for specific uses, and allocated by the Executive Branch of the Government to other uses.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin has followed with interest many of the projects in the National Institutes of Health. I would like to get some help from him to assist me in replying to a letter from one of my constituents which indicates he has some concern over one of the projects in the NIH. It has to do with the allocation of \$1,201,925 for a study of the "Effectual Relationships of the Infant Monkey to His Mother."

The complete letter is as follows:

WEST SPRINGFIELD, MASS., March 6, 1962.  
Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: A news item in the West Springfield Record, dated March 1, 1962, states that the National Institutes of Health have been allotted \$1,201,925 for a study of the "effectual relationships of the infant monkey to his mother."

Can it be true that when our Federal deficit amounts to billions of dollars a year and the public debt is approximately \$300 billion, that the Representatives of our people in Congress feel it a wise expenditure to find out if and why a baby monkey loves his mother? Could it be possible that the information as given in the local paper is taken out of context? If not, what would be the reasoning of our Representatives to authorize expenditures of this nature?

Does it not seem ironic to you that if such an expenditure is to be made that it is necessary that we enlist the aid of housewives and schoolchildren to go from house to house asking for contributions to aid in the research to determine causes and cure of cancer? Similarly, the same type of pleading goes for donations of dollars toward similar assistance for medical research in other fields such as heart disease, polio, et cetera. Does this not seem like a sad commentary on our judgments as to the collection and expenditures of our wealth?

We shall be interested in your comments.  
Very truly yours,

C. MILTON EKBERG.

Mr. BOLAND. I think I know the answer. I recognize this is an important program, but I know the gentleman knows it much better than I, and therefore I would appreciate his reply to the inquiry.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] asked this question. This is a grant recently made to Prof. Harry Harlow of the University of Wisconsin for comprehensive behavioral studies of monkeys. This grant has been publicized in a prejudicial and uninformed way. As a result, many members have received correspondence from constituents who have expressed themselves as being opposed to expenditure of funds for such studies.

These press items were published before the appropriation hearings for the National Institutes of Health were held, and the hearings offered an opportunity to go into this matter carefully, critically, and at length.

I want to set the record straight at this time for a number of reasons.

First, serious scientific work of great value has been held up to ridicule on the basis of misinformation. Second, it is perfectly plain that there is a remarkable coincidence in that many of those who have been most active in publicizing this grant in an unfavorable way are also among those who oppose adequate support of medical research. Third, the mechanism for providing information to Congress on National Institutes of Health research grants is faulty, and the deficiencies of the procedure account in large part for the distorted version of Professor Harlow's work which reached the press. I will propose a change in this system.

Professor Harlow's work has been lampooned as a study of monkey business on why monkey babies love their mothers. This caricature is all in good fun until it is taken seriously and used as a weapon to attack appropriations for medical research. At this point, the matter becomes serious, and I wish to treat it seriously.

There is now no doubt whatever that the relationship of a child to its mother can establish a large part of a child's enduring personality, and affect mental health and illness. A hostile relationship can generate personality difficulties. Absence of the mother can have very serious consequences for children.

Now, we cannot deliberately treat children as experimental subjects—depriving them of their mothers and so forth—in order to study them and their behavior scientifically. We can do this with animals. Various species of monkeys are the closest to humans of all animal species. They are close enough to humans so that the results of studies on them are directly relevant to human behavior, even though the results are not directly applicable. There has recently been some irresponsible talk ridiculing the idea that experiments on monkeys are relevant to man. I have often wondered whether people who talk this way think that it was an accident that a chimpanzee was chosen to precede man into space. The minds, as well as the bodies, of these animals are close enough to man to make results of experiments relevant to man.

Actually, Professor Harlow's studies extend far beyond the relationships between children and mothers. He is studying the learning process in monkeys and how well monkeys at different age levels learn. He is looking into brain damage of infant monkeys before, during, and shortly after birth by deliberately creating damage and measuring the consequences for learning, behavior, intelligence, and physical development. This is obviously related to study of mental retardation in humans, and it is the kind of controlled experiment that is not possible on humans.

Dr. Harlow is looking into the cause and cure of a number of diseases related to the absence of specific enzymes in the body. Some of these diseases can be produced in monkeys, and the diseases studied in a controlled manner. This work is also directly related to the study of mental retardation in humans.

In short, it takes no more than acquaintance with a few simple facts to

realize that Professor Harlow's research is scientifically serious and related to specific human problems. These facts could have been determined with ease by any Member of the House who would take the trouble to ask the National Institutes of Health to supply them. Many Members have done so, and are well informed. Others secure information routinely under a procedure which gives them only the title of the project. The procedure is faulty for this and other more fundamental reasons, and I will urge that the procedure be abandoned.

The cost as well as the content of Professor Harlow's research has been criticized. The kinds of studies that he and his group carry on are expensive. They require a large animal colony and care of the animals over a long period. The team of research scientists and technicians required for the studies is substantial. The budget totals approximate \$1 million over a 5-year period.

The most important point in connection with the budget is that it has gone through a double review procedure. First, a group of outstanding scientists who comprise a cross section of the most able experts in the country in Professor Harlow's field of research have reviewed his research proposals and the prospective costs. They gave the studies a very high rating and recommended the proposed budget. Then, the National Advisory Mental Health Council reviewed the opinions of the initial reviewers. This Council is a body established by Congress, and by law it consists of outstanding laymen as well as scientists. The Surgeon General cannot make a research grant unless the Council recommends favorable action. The Council did recommend that the grant be made to Professor Harlow in the amount proposed. It would be difficult to establish a review procedure that would surpass the one to which this grant was subjected. Let me summarize the actual review procedure and the findings of reviewers on this grant:

Dr. Harlow's research grant applications have been reviewed three times since the original award in 1954; these reviews occurred in June 1957, in March 1958, and, most recently, in November 1960. The reviewers in all cases have been uniformly enthusiastic about Dr. Harlow's research. In 1958, for example, the reviewing study section indicated that Dr. Harlow's request for support should be recommended for approval because his developmental study is among the best that has been attempted and it ought to be continued over a longer period of time with an increased number of animals. The reviewers also expressed the opinion that Dr. Harlow's laboratory is the only first-class primate laboratory in the country devoted largely to the study of behavior. Further, both the study section and the National Advisory Mental Health Council felt that Dr. Harlow and his ingenious group could be counted on to uncover many new leads and make new discoveries not now predictable, and that contributions from this laboratory can be expected. \* \* \* Other comments referred to the outstanding effectiveness with which Dr. Harlow has organized this large-scale research program, freeing himself from routine duties, so that he can devote his creative talents to the laboratory and to the planning and interpreting of research. One of the additional gains which has resulted from Dr. Harlow's work is the training opportunity

which his laboratory affords, on both a predoctoral and postdoctoral level. Scientists who have received this training have been in demand in other laboratories and have made noteworthy contributions in their own right.

I am sure that few persons who have questioned the wisdom of this grant have any idea of the caliber of the many individuals—scientists and laymen—who have critically analyzed this proposal before the final decision on payment was made.

Of course, the key to the quality of the research is Professor Harlow himself. From the press comment and letters from constituents, a person would come to the conclusion that Dr. Harlow is a combination quack and impractical, absentminded professor. We have an unfortunate habit in this country of looking at our scientists that way. First, we ridicule them; then we hold them in awe when the results of their work—which none of us in this Chamber are capable of really understanding and judging—are applied with spectacular results.

Let me summarize Dr. Harlow's qualifications: He has vigorously pursued a distinguished academic and research career ever since he received his doctorate in 1930. He is a full professor of psychology at the University of Wisconsin and has served as chairman of his department. In 1955 he was named George Cary Comstock research professor in psychology at Wisconsin; he was a Carnegie fellow in anthropology at Columbia University in 1939-40; he served as Chief of Human Resources Research for the Army in 1950-52 and is a member of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Among other honors and distinctions, he has served as editor of the *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* since 1951. He was president of the Division of Anthropology and Psychology of the National Research Council in 1954-56, and president of the American Psychological Association in 1957-58.

Since 1954, when he received his first Public Health Service research grant, he has published some two dozen articles in various scientific journals. In 1960 he received the "Distinguished Scientific Contribution Citation" of the American Psychological Association, which carries with it a \$1,000 award. The citation, itself, is an indication of the attitude of his scientific colleagues toward Dr. Harlow's work and reads as follows:

For his indefatigable curiosity which has opened up new areas of research in animal behavior and has helped greatly to keep comparative psychology near the center of the psychological stage. \* \* \* His unswerving devotion to fact, observation, and experiment has given his contribution an integrity of inestimable value to scientific psychology.

Dr. Harlow's research is supported not only by the National Institute of Mental Health, but by other important organizations. Other parts of the Public Health Service are financing his work on the effect of radiation in animals. The Ford Foundation and the Depart-

ment of Defense have both considered his research to be so significant that they have given him substantial financial aid.

In summary, on every count, the decision to support Professor Harlow was a sound one. Review of the facts can lead only to the conclusion that those who have protested against aiding this research are ignorant of the facts, or that they have used this grant as a weapon to attack medical research in general, and, in particular, aid to medical research through the appropriation for the National Institutes of Health.

The chairman of the subcommittee in charge of that appropriation has stated the case for the appropriation in masterful terms. I support the appropriation. Professor Harlow's work provides an opportunity to bring not only his research, but the superb system of Federal-university cooperation in medical research again to the attention of the House. I am confident that the full appropriation will be voted.

I would like to turn briefly now to another matter. How could such a garbled, partial version of a serious research effort be widely disseminated? The answer lies in a procedure promulgated by the executive branch. I refer explicitly to an order put out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, effective January 2, 1962, which requires that Congressmen be notified of grants made in their districts before the scientist or institution receiving the grant is notified. This includes institutional grants, demonstration grants, construction grants, and program grants.

This procedure goes far beyond the provision of information which Congress needs to do its job. I am for full disclosure to Congress of all executive acts which bear upon the effective discharge of the constitutional responsibilities of Congress. But I am opposed to a system which threatens the effectiveness of a splendid system of support for medical research and other activities, and which is intended simply to place Congressmen in a position to make political capital out of grants distributed on the basis of entirely nonpolitical factors. That is the purpose of the HEW directive. The people in the Department no doubt meant well in this offer of information to Congressmen, but I do not believe that they understood the full implications of their action, or the reaction of the House.

Let me be more specific as to why this procedure is obnoxious to me.

Most important is the fact that the grants in question are made on the basis of objective judgments, generally on the basis of advice from distinguished scientists and other citizens selected from all over the country. There is no political influence in the award of the grants. When a Congressman issues a press release announcing such a grant to his district before the recipient hears about it, there is the clear implication that he played a part in the selection process. I have heard of cases in which scientists engaged in medical research have read a number of different newspaper announcements of grants—from Congressmen and Senators—before receiving official notification of grants. This is

wrong, and it is a threat to a system which has thus far distributed funds solely on the basis of merit without any tinge of political motives or interests.

Congress does have the continuing responsibility to examine the operation of these programs, to criticize them, and to set levels of appropriations. I would not tolerate any withholding of information relevant to these responsibilities.

But the procedure to which I object cannot help the Congress carry out its responsibilities. Over the long run it will hamper effective congressional action.

If any Congressman wants to secure information about any individual grant made by any part of DHEW, I am sure that appropriate information will be made available. Certainly I have never encountered any difficulty on this score, and I trust that other Members of the House have had the same experience. In this connection, in my judgment, HEW cannot give Congressmen the full details of individual grants. These grants are made to further the work of scientists and their institutions, and these scientists are not competent to tell what the money is being used for. Interpretation to Congressmen, to newspapers, or to anybody else, of the details of the use of a grant should continue to remain the privilege of the recipients. In my judgment, if anyone in the Congress wants to know what a grant is about, or to make any statement about the purpose of a grant, he should ask the scientist or institution concerned. Otherwise, the consequences are likely to be harmful.

Let me call to the attention of my colleagues some of the consequences of their notifying universities and scientists of research and other grants. People who receive these grants will begin to assume that we influence individual decisions on these matters. They will hold their Congressmen responsible for requests that are turned down, as well as those that are approved. They will begin to route these requests through your offices. This is bad for science and scientists. It is bad for universities. And it will be bad for Congressmen. The basic reason why it is bad is that these grants are nonpolitical. To inject a political note through implying that individual Congressmen have influence in the award of these grants is a disservice to the country.

I trust that Secretary Ribicoff will recognize that the new procedure is misguided, harmful, and wasteful, and that it will be withdrawn.

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted at the gentleman's observation, and I appreciate his comments. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman. I think it might be summarized, and I say this as a man who perhaps has had as much experience with experiments on animals as anyone on the floor. It might be that some raised the question of superiority until someone came along and gave the evolution of the species by

Darwin, so now they do not know whether he is his brother's keeper or the keeper of his brothers. Now I would like to go from the ridiculous to the sublime. I call your attention to page 14 of the report. This has reference to the committee and the House grant last year of \$10 million for the construction of a hospital research facility of a particular type. The last sentence reads:

The committee hopes that the indications of its feelings during the course of the hearings and through this report will stir the Department to a little more activity.

Does that mean that this is still an appropriated fund and can still be held over and used for the construction of this hospital if the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, in his wisdom, and the people of the location got together and decided that they were finally going to start this \$10 million or \$11 million hospital?

Mr. LAIRD. Most of the funds are still available.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. They are available and could still be used if applications are submitted for good projects and approved before next July 1.

But we have been told the people have still not come up with a complete plan.

Mr. HALL. I know they have been slow, and I know why they have been a little slow, and I am not contesting that. I just wanted to know whether the funds were still available.

Mr. LAIRD. The funds are available under the terms of the appropriation made last year. I thought you were directing your attention to the language of the committee report. The committee report does not make funds available. That language encourages them to put to good use the appropriation of last year, which funds are still available.

Mr. HALL. I certainly understand the rules and the procedure that the report does not bear on the actual appropriation. But I used it as a point. In fact, is this another example of where the administration has not expended or followed the direction or the intent of Congress?

Mr. LAIRD. This is partially that, but I think the people involved with the projects have not come forward with the complete application under the rules and regulations which have been set forth by the Surgeon General for this program. I am not referring just to the situation in Rochester with reference to the Methodist Hospital—but some of these people that are interested in making applications feel that the restrictions that have been set up for the applications have been a little too severe. They are hopeful that some changes can be made in the policy guidance.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Going back to the gentleman's very well-taken remarks that in many areas in order to balance the

budget or to keep it from being in deficit further, we have not expended funds that were appropriated. Has the committee in its wisdom seen fit to direct the administration to spend such funds as are authorized in this bill and subsequently appropriated, as we considered them in the Armed Services Committee until the distinguished chairman took the walk in the rose garden?

Mr. LAIRD. It is the feeling of our committee that this cannot be done. We can merely appropriate and it is up to the executive branch to make the determination as to whether the funds will be expended.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his remarks, particularly those remarks relating to the inclusion in this appropriation bill of the correct entitlements to the impacted areas for the advancement of educational programs in those areas. I am very sure that the action reflects the intent of Congress. I would like to commend the entire committee for its action.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am still lost in the rose garden. I wonder if the gentleman can clear this up for me:

Now, what happens to these funds that have been reserved and which have been referred to in this discussion, applying, as I recall the hearing record, both to the Department of Labor and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? With respect to the reservation of funds, what happens to these funds? Are they continuing funds? What happens to them?

Mr. LAIRD. In most cases, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, the funds lapse on June 30 of this year. Take, for instance, the Food and Drug Administration, those funds will lapse. The funds of the National Institutes of Health that are in reserve will lapse. We will have a total in lapsed accounts in 1962 of in the neighborhood of about \$80 million or so under the current reserves.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will take another minute or two, can the gentleman give us any idea of how much is to be carried over as a result of this reservation or reserving of funds by the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. LAIRD. I do not have the exact figures but it would be a relatively small amount.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, practically all of this money then must revert to the Treasury as of July 1 of this year?

Mr. LAIRD. Almost all of the reserves will.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. With regard to the comments which the gentleman made in connection with the primate study, I would like to point out that it looks as if possibly the results of this legislation might be that an institution in the district which I represent, the Yerkes Laboratory for Primates, which has been in existence now for a third of a century, will be wiped out because of certain funds being made available in the way in which this bill is making them available. I am still making my studies on this. I am not sure this is so, but I do know that the threat is very possible. I do not know whether I will offer an amendment on it or not at this time, but I would like to have it pointed out on the floor of the House that for a third of a century, at Orange Park, Fla., there has been a primate study laboratory, a fine one, called Yerkes Laboratory. As I understand, if facilities are made available to Emory University in Atlanta for a southeastern primate study laboratory, the chances are very great today that this one in Orange Park, which has existed all this time, will be abolished, because of the fact that Federal funds are made available to Emory University for the southeastern primate laboratory.

If that is what happens, this will mean that the Federal Government will be expending Federal moneys to wipe out a free-enterprise institution, philanthropically run, for a third of a century in this field, and which is the primary laboratory in this field.

I should think certainly that it would be a rather serious and sad commentary upon the utilization of Federal funds appropriated by the U.S. Congress. As I say, I am not sure of all these details. I do know, however, that the Yerkes Laboratory is a leader in this field. I do know of things that have appeared in the press and I know that apparently if funds are made available to Emory University, which has a titular title to this, although it does not have the entire beneficial title—Yale University was the one that developed it—we have a situation of having local universities, Jacksonville University and the University of Florida, in the community, not knowing that they would have the opportunity to do this sort of work. It is my opinion that some opportunity should be made available so that these local universities may be able to save this fine institution, Yerkes Laboratory, which would be wiped out by the expenditure of Federal funds.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman, that as far as primate colonies are concerned, we have already established three new primate colonies in the last 3 years; one in Washington, one in Oregon, and one is being established now at the University of Wisconsin. But from the testimony which has been given to our committee we have a great shortage in this area.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Apparently Emory University is going to abolish Yerkes laboratory if it gets these

funds for this laboratory. That is what I am fearful of. I think the public ought to have an opportunity to save this laboratory. The actual result will be, as I understand, that Emory has said that if it gets these Federal funds it is going to abolish Yerkes Laboratory so that actually Federal funds will be abolishing a fine, philanthropic organization which has done probably the best work that has been done in this field in our country.

Mr. LAIRD. I do not think the grant has been approved to Emory University.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. We do not make decisions such as is involved here. If a determination is made it will be made by the National Heart Advisory Council. We have never interfered with their proceedings. It is not a decision that we make in our committee.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to make clear what the actual situation is, Yerkes Laboratory was established by Yale University a long time ago. Very recently Emory University acquired titular title, but not entire beneficial title. However, it does have titular title. In no other university in the area where Yerkes Laboratory is, would thought have been given to trying to underbid or get away this southeastern laboratory because they would have assumed that Emory University would not move the Yerkes facility away. Emory has now sought to obtain a facility from the Federal Government which they apparently expect to use to wipe out Yerkes Laboratory.

Mr. LAIRD. They have an application in.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I understand it has been approved and that nobody in the executive branch thinks he can stop this approval.

Therefore, it is probable that it would take legislation to allow other universities and colleges to have an opportunity to get into this field to preserve Yerkes Laboratory they having been misled.

Mr. LAIRD. It does not take legislation; any university or college can make application.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Not at this stage. If they could, I would be very happy about this bill.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure they can make application because other primate centers will be constructed.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Then, can we have it as a part of the legislative process on this bill that they would be open for other universities to be considered in this?

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure it was open at the time Emory put in their application.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. At the time Emory did, nobody in the locality thought that Emory was going to move away from the Yerkes Laboratory. At that time, other universities were much closer to the facility and utilized this facility a great deal more than Emory itself in regard to the research and probably did not put one in too for the simple reason that they thought Emory

was going to leave it there. That is where the unfairness is in this.

Mr. LAIRD. This is a matter that the National Heart Council has to pass on. The funds have not been released by the administration for that project as yet.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I hope they will not be released until universities and colleges in the area may have an opportunity in this field.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I understand on research contracts let by the National Institute of Health, there is an arbitrary limitation of 15 percent on indirect costs. An institution in the area I represent, the California Institute of Technology advises me on a contract of \$1,300,000 their indirect cost is 28 percent, meaning that they would have to pick up 13 percent of the direct cost and on that ratio, a loss of \$178,000. Has the committee considered adjusting that ratio to the total cost?

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Rhode Island commented on this earlier in the discussion today, and I agree with him that this is a matter that needs review. I personally believe we have to establish some sort of uniform policy on overhead costs on these grants and contracts. We have the Department of Defense paying as high as 100 percent for indirect costs. We have the National Science Foundation paying a different percentage than the Atomic Energy Commission. We have all of these various governmental agencies into this program of direct research grants to colleges and universities, and the amount of indirect cost allowed varies considerably. I feel this is a policy decision that has to be made by our Committee on Appropriations and we have to arrive at some uniform rate of indirect overhead costs. Last year I suggested a 20 percent limitation. It is my hope that this will be done, and we hope to arrive at some decision by the time this bill goes to conference.

Mr. HIESTAND. Does not the gentleman and the committee, of course, realize that indirect costs must vary very greatly depending on the type of research?

Mr. LAIRD. They vary greatly, I understand that and they vary a great deal depending on the kind of accounting procedure that the individual schools use. We are presently studying an investigative staff report on this whole matter. It is my hope that this question can be satisfactorily resolved this year.

Mr. HIESTAND. Does the gentleman have an idea that some relief or flexibility can be worked in?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, I hope so and I favor working out a compromise proposal which will be fair to our universities and colleges.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is not one in which either we save dollars or save lives but rather an object lesson in how to spend wisely so that more of our citizens may live

more days in health and comfort in years to come.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, our colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, who has brought out this bill and all the members of his subcommittee, deserve credit for foresight, recognition for their depth of understanding and praise for their diligence in a most complicated field. What they are saying to us today is "Nation cure thyself." The message of this bill is that we mean to continue to lead the world in research, discovery, prevention, and cure in every field of mental and bodily welfare. It is a call for progress in reducing the irritation and damage of air pollution and the end to the despoiling of the water ways of the Nation.

Among other things I commend the subcommittee for taking action that will allow the implementation of a plan for control of venereal diseases. A distinguished force, under the leadership of Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of health in the city of New York, has made a thorough study of this program and comes forth with valuable recommendations. These can be brought to bear on the problem as a result of our action on this day.

One of the most significant features of this bill is the allocation of \$130,599,000, an increase of \$24,723,000 over the amount appropriated for 1962 for mental health activities. This increase, and the concern of our Government in this most challenging field, is due in no small measure to the activities of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. Dedicated people in and out of Government who work in this field can take an increased measure of hope from the interest of the Congress in a concerted effort that will treat the whole maze of problems, including but not limited to, drug addiction, alcoholism, psychoses, and mental retardation with due regard for the basic and applied research so vital to this program. I hail the further foresight of my colleagues in the provision for increased care in the treatment of chronic diseases and health of the aged.

The exceptional citizens of our country, such as those who are deaf, will have more teachers under the provisions of this bill. Retarded children will be benefited through increased programs of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and the National Mental Health Institute.

The other programs which are encouraged, expanded, and accelerated through the efforts of this outstanding subcommittee of the Congress are too numerous to mention and yet each in its own way is of importance to thousands of our citizens in need of help. The work of the Congress today in extending a humane and forthright hand to our fellow citizens means "heap good medicine" in the future of this Nation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill once again—as it has been every



year in which Congressman FOGARTY has served as chairman of the subcommittee handling it—is a most remarkable piece of legislation, for it uses the vehicle of an appropriation bill to do much more than merely provide funds for some Government agencies. As usual, the report accompanying the bill prods, stimulates, encourages, directs and scolds the agencies having such tremendous responsibility for the health and well-being of the American people to do a better job with the generous funds we give them—and to use imagination and courage in pursuing new avenues of service to the public.

I do not want to take the time here to try to comment on everything in the bill or report. But I do want to single out several items in which I am particularly interested. For instance, the bill provides the maximum amount possible under law for programs now in effect for fellowships for training teachers of the mentally retarded and the deaf. These are good programs, which we have enacted just in the past few years—the retarded children program in 1958, I believe, and the program for the deaf last year. The subcommittee urges legislative action to remove some of the restrictions on appropriations, so that more can be spent than the \$1 million a year now authorized for the retarded program and the \$1,500,000 for training teachers of deaf children.

Fortunately, the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor has been conducting hearings on bills for encouraging the training of more teachers for all categories of exceptional children. I am very proud of the fact that my bill on this subject, H.R. 15 in this Congress, was the first measure ever introduced to provide for an overall program of Federal fellowships and scholarships for teachers of exceptional children, including the gifted as well as the handicapped children. The predecessor of H.R. 15 was introduced in 1957. I am hopeful that this legislation can finally be enacted. The need for good teachers, specially trained in working with exceptional children, is urgent.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to note that virtually every dollar recommended in the President's budget for the Food and Drug Administration is included in this bill today. The increase of \$5,280,000 for FDA over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year will make possible a substantial step-up in enforcement activity in some of the most vital areas of consumer protection. The

report notes that some members of the Committee on Appropriations apparently felt the FDA budget is too high. I am glad to note that the committee nevertheless went along with the Fogarty subcommittee on this, for it is obvious to anyone who studies the full operations of the Food and Drug Administration that its job is a never-ending one and the proper performance of that job is essential to every citizen.

The new budget will make possible a significant increase in the number of agricultural shipments which FDA can inspect for evidence of illegal residue of pesticides. With the increase recommended, the Food and Drug people will be able to double their present inspection activity in this area—from about one-third of 1 percent of agricultural shipments to about two-thirds of 1 percent. If a similar increase is provided again the following year, we will then get up to the bare minimum of safety in this area by providing for about 25,000 such inspections a year out of the total of 250,000 shipments—the goal of 1 percent coverage.

I am sorry that 2 years ago, when I tried to amend the bill to provide then for sufficient funds to make a 1 percent sample each year, the managers of the bill felt they had to oppose me on this. I realize that the Fogarty subcommittee usually stands together, usually in unanimous action on this major appropriation bill, but I am indeed sorry that the decision 2 years ago was to hold to a less-than-adequate budget and to oppose my efforts to increase it. If my amendment had been accepted 2 years ago, we would by now have been up to the 1 percent level of coverage on pesticides inspection, and furthermore all of our FDA district offices and labs would have been modernized by now. This way, we still have another 2 years to go on both objectives. The goal of my amendment on radioactivity surveys of food is not yet even in sight 2 years later.

However, in view of the magnificent work done by the subcommittee again this year in so many different areas of consumer health and protection, I certainly do not want to appear to be critical over something that happened 2 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, the most important need for protection of our consumers now in the food, drug and cosmetic field is in the strengthening of the basic law. The President has called for this and I know there is widespread support for it. I do not know what is taking the executive agencies so long in sending their re-

ports to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H.R. 1235 but I certainly wish they would get busy on it. I checked with the committee again last night and the reports requested on H.R. 1235 in February 1961—13 months ago—from HEW, Treasury, Justice, Commerce, Agriculture and the Budget Bureau still have not been filed with the committee. Meantime, the loopholes remain in the basic law.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Missouri yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state with regard to the amendment of 2 years ago by the gentlewoman, in 1962 the Administration froze funds in the Food and Drug Administration. We appropriated at a level, for the Food and Drug Administration, salaries and expenses, of \$23 million. The New Frontier froze the item for "Salaries and expenses" by \$903,000 in the area of certification, care, inspection, and other services. This adds up to a total in the Food and Drug Administration of \$1,118,000, or a total reduction from the appropriations which we made of \$2,633,000.

I point that out because in talking about whether you reach this one percent level or not, an amendment increasing funds last year would not have done any good. The Administration did not even spend the amount appropriated by this Congress; yet they keep sending messages up here about the importance of the Food and Drug Administration, and try to put the onus on the Congress for not cooperating in this program. We are cooperating. They are not going along with the expenditure of revenue that Congress has made available. I think this should be made known to the American people.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am glad the gentleman is doing it. I hope the gentleman will explain why the funds were frozen.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not in position to explain the reason for the President's refusing to spend these funds of the Food and Drug Administration. I believe the inquiry should be directed to the President of the United States and not to me as a minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations. I will insert at this point in the Record a table setting forth appropriations and reserves for 1962 in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as of 12 p.m. today:

## Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations and reserves, fiscal year 1962

	1962 appropri- ation	Formal reserves			Administra- tive reserves	Total re- serves
		For savings	For obliga- tion in sub- sequent years	For other contingen- cies		
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
Salaries and expenses.....	\$23,060,000	\$633,000			\$243,000	\$903,000
Certification, inspection, and other services (indefinite).....	(1,882,000)		(\$1,016,622)		(92,000)	(1,198,622)
Pharmacology-animal laboratory building.....	1,750,000			\$1,730,000		1,730,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	24,750,000	633,000	(1,016,622)	1,730,000	243,000	2,633,000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Promotion and further development of vocational education.....	33,672,000					
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.....	8,194,000					
Land-grant college aid, Hawaii.....	3,775,000					
Grants for library services.....	7,500,000					
Payments to school districts.....	231,293,000					
Assistance for school construction.....	54,850,000					
Defense educational activities.....	211,627,000	15,843,000	18,870,000	37,520,000		72,233,000
Expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded.....	1,000,000					
Training teachers of the deaf.....	1,500,000				16,000	16,000
Salaries and expenses.....	11,669,000				123,000	123,000
Cooperative research.....	5,000,000				352,000	352,000
Total, Office of Education.....	570,080,000	15,843,000	18,870,000	37,520,000	491,000	72,724,000
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION						
Grants to States.....	64,450,000					
Research and training.....	20,250,000				377,000	377,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program).....	1,372,000					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,325,000				40,000	40,000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	88,397,000				417,000	417,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE						
Buildings and facilities.....	18,230,000			17,705,858		17,705,858
Accident prevention.....	3,618,000				62,000	62,000
Chronic diseases and health of the aged.....	10,958,000				1,193,000	1,193,000
Communicable disease activities.....	10,000,000				233,000	233,000
Community health practice and research.....	24,336,000				202,000	202,000
Control of tuberculosis.....	6,493,000					
Control of venereal disease.....	6,000,000					
Dental services and resources.....	2,500,000				100,000	100,000
Nursing services and resources.....	7,675,000				82,000	82,000
Hospital construction activities.....	211,500,000				1,883,000	1,883,000
Air pollution control.....	8,800,000				336,000	336,000
Milk, food, interstate and community sanitation.....	7,424,000			1,457,000	99,000	1,556,000
Occupational health.....	3,981,000				39,000	39,000
Radiological health.....	10,647,000					
Water supply and water pollution control.....	20,328,000			500,000	1,129,000	1,629,000
Grants for waste treatment works construction.....	80,000,000					
Construction, environmental health center.....						
Foreign quarantine activities.....	6,084,000				55,000	56,000
Hospitals and medical care.....	49,835,000				111,000	111,000
Indian health activities.....	53,010,000					
Construction of Indian health facilities.....	8,285,000			1,389,975		1,389,975
Construction of mental health-neurology research facilities.....				12,028,000		12,028,000
National Institutes of Health:						
General research and services.....	127,637,000			0	2,163,000	2,163,000
National Cancer Institute.....	142,836,000			4,393,000	11,404,000	15,797,000
Mental health activities.....	108,876,000			137,000	913,000	1,050,000
National Heart Institute.....	132,912,000			6,225,000	13,370,000	19,595,000
National Institute of Dental Research.....	17,340,000			321,000	1,710,000	2,031,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	81,831,000			577,000	216,000	793,000
Allergy and infectious disease activities.....	56,091,000			140,000		140,000
Neurology and blindness activities.....	70,812,000			3,570,000	1,460,000	5,030,000
Grants for construction of cancer research facilities.....	5,000,000					
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health.....	743,335,000			15,363,000	31,236,000	46,599,000
Grants for construction of hospital research facilities.....	10,000,000					
Grants for construction of health research facilities.....	30,000,000					
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program).....	9,000,000					
National health statistics.....	4,642,000				147,000	147,000
Operations, National Library of Medicine.....	2,066,000			155,000	15,000	170,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers, indefinite.....	(2,180,000)					
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Surgeon General.....	5,375,000				40,000	40,000
Civil defense medical stockpile.....	13,000,000					
Total, Public Health Service.....	1,367,122,000			48,764,833	36,803,000	85,567,833
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL						
Salaries and expenses.....	5,105,000					
Buildings and facilities.....	575,000			685,000		685,000
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	5,680,000			685,000		685,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						
Limitation on salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (trust fund).....	(267,570,000)	(1,400,000)				(1,400,000)
Limitation on construction, BOASI (trust fund).....	(4,000,000)		(4,067,831)			(4,067,831)
Grants to States for public assistance.....	2,401,200,000					
Assistance to U.S. citizens returned from abroad.....	764,000					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services.....	3,442,000				96,000	96,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.....	2,668,000				36,000	36,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	69,100,000				75,000	75,000
Cooperative research in social security.....	700,000				0	0
Research and training (special foreign currency program).....	1,607,000					
Salaries and expenses, Office of Commissioner.....	590,000				34,000	34,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	(322,000)					
Total, Social Security Administration.....	2,480,071,000	(1,400,000)	(4,067,831)		241,000	241,000

## Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations and reserves, fiscal year 1962—Continued

	1962 appropriation	Formal reserves			Administrative reserves	Total reserves
		For savings	For obligation in subsequent years	For other contingencies		
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS						
American Printing House for the Blind	\$670,000					
Freedman's Hospital	3,736,000			\$3,000		\$3,000
Gallaudet College:						
Salaries and expenses	1,256,000					
Construction	601,000			336,500		336,500
Total, Gallaudet College	1,857,000			336,500		336,500
Howard University:						
Salaries and expenses	7,007,000					
Plans and specifications	461,000		\$71,538	39,000		110,538
Construction of buildings	4,447,000		368,068			368,068
Construction of auditorium-fine arts building (liquidation of contract authority)	95,000					
Total, Howard University	12,010,000		440,206	39,000		479,206
Total, special institutions	18,273,000		440,206	378,500		818,706
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
Office of the Secretary	2,527,000				\$69,000	69,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund	(352,000)					
Office of Field Administration	3,265,000				47,000	47,000
Transfers	(1,465,000)					
Surplus property utilization	862,000				11,000	11,000
Office of the General Counsel	713,000				11,000	11,000
Transfers	(696,000)					
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses	8,200,000				1,754,000	1,754,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	15,567,000				1,892,000	1,892,000
Total, direct appropriations, DHEW	4,569,940,000	\$16,476,000	19,310,206	89,078,333	40,087,000	164,951,539

NOTE.—Included in the amounts listed above are the following items which were taken into account when applying the economy reductions:

Administrative reserves.....	\$55,398,000
From formal reserves:	
Food and Drug Administration.....	633,000
Office of Education (National Defense Education Act).....	19,802,000

Public Health Service:	
Buildings and facilities.....	\$10,000,000
Foreign quarantine activities.....	17,000
National Institutes of Health.....	15,823,000
National Library of Medicine and other.....	159,000
Total.....	101,832,000

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am glad to have that information. I will try to find out myself why it was frozen because I think we need it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, because it so intimately involves each of us in our daily lives, there is probably no more interesting bill to work on than the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the related agencies.

The importance of the bill is reflected in the high regard shown for the work of our chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY, by people all over the country. His growing national reputation as a crusader for the programs which most directly promote the general welfare is witness to his dedicated work year in and year out. This reputation is well deserved for no man works harder to bring before the House a bill that will meet the needs of people everywhere in our country.

He is ably seconded in these dedicated efforts by our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, WINFIELD DENTON. His legal training and experience are valuable assets to the subcommittee in cutting through the redtape in which we sometimes become entangled. His careful questioning often resulted in action to simplify unnecessarily complicated procedures which grow up in the bureaus of Government. His knowledge of labor legislation and his

understanding of the problems of workmen give him an insight into their needs that is evident in all of his efforts.

On the other side, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, MELVIN LAIRD, is a competent and hard-working member of the subcommittee. He has earned a reputation for doing his home work, and his probing questions about details of the programs under consideration are evidence of this. No man is more insistent that the taxpayers get a dollar's worth of service for every dollar spent.

I previously had the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations with our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, ROBERT MICHEL, and learned then to respect his ability. His interest in the work of the agencies with which we are concerned is matched by his competence and his increasing influence upon the deliberations of the subcommittee.

All of us, of course, share an affection and admiration for our able Clerk, Robert Moyer. As any Member of Congress who has ever been associated with him knows, he is an able and courteous man, always willing to be of service.

#### BILL AFFECTS ALL AMERICANS

It is to be expected that a bill which touches so many aspects of the personal lives of so many Americans would lend itself to controversy. It is amazing to me, therefore, that we are able to bring before you today a bill that has the unanimous approval of our committee.

If each of us had our individual way, I am sure there are items that we would like to have changed in one way or another. All of us, however, are com-

mitted to the broad objectives of the great variety of programs which are directed to the health and well-being of all of our citizens. Whatever ideological or philosophical differences we may have, we are all interested in improving the opportunities of every citizen to share in the great advances made in the preservation of human life and for life's well-being.

#### PROGRAMS OFFER OPPORTUNITIES

The great majority of programs included in this bill are concerned with increasing and improving opportunities—for better education, for better health, for gainful and honorable employment, for a richer and more secure old age. Laws, we know, cannot of themselves provide these blessings. Laws can only attempt to help people themselves create the conditions under which as many as possible may achieve for themselves the benefits made possible through new knowledge and new technology.

It is easy enough sometimes to lose sight of people in trying to cope with the unbelievably complicated legislative problems of a country that has grown as rapidly as ours. In our work on this bill, however, we deal in every item and in every line with people and their problems, especially the problems born of the uncertainties of human life. We are sometimes faced with the opposite danger of becoming so involved in the personal problems of so many people that we forget the limitations of law.

#### PRESENT A BALANCED BILL

We have tried to keep a proper balance in this bill, providing the funds necessary to carry out the essential pro-

visions of law as intended by the Congress while eliminating or reducing funds for questionable and fringe activities.

There are many worthy endeavors on which more could be spent, but it is our responsibility to keep in mind the entire costs of Government. Within the limits of the resources available, I think we have chosen wisely for the most part.

#### LABOR DEPARTMENT

The reduction of \$8,223,000 below the budget requests for the Department of Labor should not adversely affect the many and varied essential activities within its purview. Significant improvements are being made in important areas. Although it is not possible to discuss all of them today, I do wish to refer to several matters discussed during our debate last year.

A problem that has always concerned me in my work on the subcommittee has been the mass of useless paperwork required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Thousands and thousands of reports of little or no real value or legal purpose have been accumulating under this law. It has been costing almost \$600,000 a year to manage this collection of worthless documents.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFER IMPROVEMENT

In my remarks to the House last year, attention was directed to the responsibility of the Committee on Education and Labor to correct the situation. Members of the committee have been aware of the obvious defects in the original legislation and gave corrective legislation high priority this year. Now that the amendments have been approved by the House and the Senate, it is my hope that we will have meaningful enforcement.

Almost 100 million Americans, over half of our population, are entitled to benefits of one kind or another under these welfare plans. They have a right to protection against misuse of any of the \$60 billion worth of assets and insurance reserves held by company and union pension plans. Welfare and pension fund reserves are expected to reach \$100 billion in a few years. It is readily apparent that the men and women who rely upon these funds for future benefits have a right to know what is being done with them. The enforcement powers granted in the recent action of the Congress, if properly exercised, should improve the situation which has been troubling us.

#### LANDRUM-GRIFFIN EXPENSES

I continue to be concerned, however, over the expensive operation of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act—Landrum-Griffin Act. The bill before you includes another \$5,675,000 for the Bureau of Labor-Management reports.

The Bureau initiated investigations in 3,762 possible violations of the act through the end of December 1961. Of these, 6,377, or about two-thirds, have been closed; 55 percent of the closed cases—3,529—failed to disclose sufficient evidence of violations to justify either criminal or administrative action; the remaining 2,838 investigations were

closed upon voluntary corrective action by the persons or organizations involved.

#### A TOTAL OF 21 CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS

A total of 323 complaints have been referred to the Department of Justice for investigation. As a result of such investigations, 36 criminal prosecutions have been instituted; 21 of these have resulted in criminal conviction; there has been 1 acquittal; 2 have resulted in dismissals; and the 12 others are still pending in the courts.

No one can condone corruption and racketeering in labor-management relations. It is evident, however, from this record that only a small minority are engaged in such practices, and it is admitted that State laws would normally cover these cases. Certainly this record does not bear out the extravagant charges of widespread gangsterism with which we were barraged by the powerful propaganda forces demanding immediate adoption of the bill.

#### TIME TO REVIEW LAW

Now that a record has been established at considerable expense to the taxpayer, it may be time to consider revisions to end some of this flurry of fruitless activity. At the very least, we could hope that the facts would enable the Congress to legislate in a calmer climate with due regard for the current high cost of paperwork.

#### HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The bill before you makes a reduction of \$103,720,000 in the overall budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Once again, the committee has been most careful in making selective reductions that will permit the maintenance and expansion of the most essential activities of the Department. It is not possible within the limits of this debate to discuss all of these programs in the detail they deserve.

Our chairman has already discussed some of the practical achievements in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease. These accomplishments have been financed by the American people through the appropriations we have made to the National Institutes of Health.

The rewards, both humanitarian and economic, are great. We can never be completely satisfied with the progress because we are dealing with lives and human well-being in the never-ending struggle against age-old enemies—cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and all of the ailments so costly in health and happiness.

#### NEED MANPOWER AND FACILITIES

It is precisely because these programs are so valuable and because they represent prudent public investment that we must continue to insist that the money be wisely spent. The record of our hearings, covering over 2,000 pages, is an indication of the thoughtful care with which we have explored these needs. We feel that we have provided the resources necessary to press the attack on these dread diseases. Money alone does not buy results, but it can provide the manpower and facilities so critically needed for successful research. We have

attempted to provide a balanced program of research at an effective pace and training to step up the pace.

Our report and the chairman's remarks have outlined specific examples of research achievements by the individual Institutes and in basic research itself. All of us want to carry forward these programs as rapidly as efficient and effective use of manpower and facilities permits.

At the same time, we must guard against the mistaken notion of crash programs for which we do not have a sufficient number of trained scientists or sufficient scientific knowledge. Proper and effective use of resources can hasten the pace at which we are making progress, but to delude our citizens into believing that extravagance of itself offers more hope would be a cruel injustice.

#### REHABILITATION OF 100,000 A YEAR

Although the work of the Institutes offers the most dramatic and often the most publicized advances made in health care, other programs of the Department are making striking contributions to the health and well-being of many millions of Americans. The Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation, for example, is now returning disabled persons to active and useful lives at the rate of more than 100,000 persons a year.

Apart from the great humanitarian benefits—which are immeasurable—it has often been testified that the Government receives approximately \$10 in return for every \$1 spent on this program. The \$72,940,000 increase recommended by the committee is directly attributable to the expected increase in State funds which will be available for matching purposes.

#### CARRY ON REGIONAL CENTERS

As part of this program, we have provided funds for the operations of the special regional rehabilitation centers established under last year's bill in my State of Minnesota and in New York. The Minnesota center is a cooperative venture between the Sister Kenny Institute and the University of Minnesota.

This program is intended to combat the serious shortage of specialists in physical medicine and rehabilitation. The pilot centers were established at the urging of our committee to study the means of developing adequate facilities for graduate medical education and research in these important fields.

#### COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH AND TRAINING

The research conducted by these centers encompasses any aspect of the rehabilitation process from onset to retraining and placement of the disabled. The training program is intended to provide training of all types, long term as well as short term, professional, technical, and for all categories of students, graduate or undergraduate, working in any of the medical or medically allied professions engaged in rehabilitation. It is intended to provide training in such areas as the principles of rehabilitation, special problems of rehabilitation as related to specific disabilities or groups of disabilities, and the interrelationship of



medical and allied medical and other disciplines in the practice of rehabilitation.

This combination of research and training brings together a concentration of the skills of many rehabilitation specialties such as medicine, rehabilitation counseling, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech and hearing, psychology, and prosthetics. The combined resources of the University of Minnesota and the Sister Kenny Institute provide an ideal example of the kind of setting needed for such a comprehensive research and training program. More of this work is needed.

#### SCARE TALK ABOUT MILK

In another area of health care of importance not only to my State but to all Americans, I questioned the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare about much of the scare talk we have heard about the use of milk and milk products. At least one factor in the unprecedented decline in milk consumption last year is the unfortunate association in the public mind between fallout and milk which had been caused by careless talk on this subject.

The Secretary told us:

We have been very, very careful in measuring radioactivity in all products, including milk, to always indicate that the amount of radioactivity in milk was such a minute amount that to remove milk from the diet would have a much greater detriment upon the people and the population of this country than any incidental harm that could possibly exist from fallout.

#### FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

The same conclusion was reached by President Kennedy in his remarks before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition. Based on the constant surveillance of this problem by the Public Health Service and other agencies of Government, he said:

Detailed guidelines to protect the health of the people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure. The milk supply offers no hazards.

Our report comments on some of the unfounded talk about the effect of dairy foods on heart ailments since this undoubtedly has been another contributing factor in the drop in milk consumption, our report states:

It has been called to the attention of the committee that the present and developing attitudes of the American people to the hazards of animal fats in the diet are based more on hypothesis than on sound and uncontroversial scientific evidence.

#### FOOD AND NUTRITION BOARD

Commenting on the same subject, the President said earlier:

The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded, after intensive research, that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to an increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element, except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

It is important that this information be made known because the sharp drop

in the use of dairy foods—milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream—has serious consequences not only for agriculture but for the nutritional health of the American people. Milk continues to be the best food we can buy to supply the vitamins, minerals, fats, sugar, and high-quality proteins the body needs. It is especially important for calcium, riboflavin, and protein.

#### NUTRITIONAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS

In addition to the serious nutritional problems implied in the decline of dairy food consumption, the situation presents economic problems in managing and marketing milk production. And what may be even more serious in the long range, it complicates the best use of soil, water, and animal resources. The dairy industry continues to be a major source of farm income and is the mainstay of sound conservation policies upon which we will become increasingly dependent in the years ahead.

In another part of this bill, dealing with environmental health activities, the committee makes note of the revolutionary changes taking place in milk production and handling methods on the farm, as well as in processing techniques in dairy plants. These changes have markedly affected established health safeguards and, therefore, impose the need for thorough investigations of their public health implications.

#### LABORATORY TESTS IMPROVED

Some of the laboratory tests which have been traditionally used by the industry and by milk sanitation control agencies have been made obsolete. We were pleased, therefore, to learn that the Public Health Service has recently developed a modified phosphatase test through which the performance of newly developed pasteurization processes can be checked. However, more needs to be done in the study of the new ultrahigh temperatures processing methods which are on the brink of commercial utilization.

In its reports for the last 2 years, the committee has stated its interest in seeing that more emphasis is placed on milk problems. We were disconcerted to note that the interstate milk certification program is still operating on an inadequate basis.

#### IMPROVE INTERSTATE MOVEMENT

At present, the level of PHS evaluations of State milk programs and spot checks of field conditions is only about 75 percent of requirements. The interstate milk certification program, begun in 1951, now facilitates the interstate movement of approximately 9 billion pounds of milk each year and is still growing. In view of the actual increase included in the bill, taking into consideration nonrecurring construction costs and comparative transfers, we expect that a more thorough job will be done in the future.

#### WATER STILL NO. 1 PROBLEM

Our No. 1 problem in environmental health and natural resources continues to be water pollution control. We have made progress since the passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in 1956. A total of 3,325 applications for

waste treatment works has been approved for grants totaling \$275 million. This was the Federal contribution to plants costing \$1.55 billion. Each Federal dollar has stimulated the expenditure of 5 local dollars on this vital work.

Although construction activity has been stepped up 62 percent during the first 4 years of the program, the conference of State sanitary engineers estimates that some 5,000 communities, with a population of 40 million people, currently need new waste treatment plants or enlargements and additions to existing plants. An average annual investment of \$600 million for 10 years will be required to satisfy this need, replace works that become obsolescent in the same period, and keep pace with the expected population growth.

#### INCLUDE 900 PROJECTS

As of January, the States reported an additional 2,054 grant requests which would require \$227 million in Federal funds. It is estimated that the \$90 million provided in the bill before the House will provide grants for 900 projects.

Grants are made to municipalities sponsoring such projects. The maximum grant to a single municipality is 30 percent of the cost of the project or \$600,000, whichever is smaller. In the case of multimunicipal projects, the grant is based on each community's share of the project cost, under the 30 percent or \$600,000 limitation, but the maximum grant for the overall project may not exceed \$2.4 million.

#### NEED COOPERATIVE APPROACH

There is no doubt that the problem is worsening as a direct result of population and industrial growth. More people, more industry, and new technological developments are creating more water pollution. The results are apparent in the increasing number and scope of fish kills, the vast water areas being closed to recreation, the growing concern over the mass of pollutants reaching city water supplies and industry's search for new locations where there is ample and suitable water.

In the last half century, this has truly become a national problem of the first magnitude. Individual communities are no longer able to cope with the problem and are not equipped to undertake the large-scale planning necessary to clean up the rivers and streams which have no regard for city or State lines. A concentrated effort by Federal, State, and local governments, and industry itself is necessary if we are to stop pollution and prevent future pollution of this precious resource.

#### POLLUTION OF UNDERGROUND WATER

We need to know a great deal more about pollution of our underground water supply, a problem of increasing importance to individual homeowners and city governments as well. The specific contaminants need to be identified and means found to reduce the occurrence of such pollution.

Research on the increasingly complex problem of water pollution has been expanded and we hope that more can be done. We no longer have a choice in this matter—the job must be done now.

Our choices are limited to the best ways and means of getting it done.

#### PUBLIC WELFARE PROBLEMS

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware that there has been growing discontent over the operation of some of our public welfare programs. Despite our ever-changing social problems, there has been no major change in our public welfare laws in the past 27 years.

It has long been recognized that abuses have crept into the programs and that the programs themselves have often become self-defeating. Instead of moving people off welfare rolls, they have actually tended to make them more dependent on the monthly welfare checks. It has become increasingly clear that money alone will not solve many of the problems of our changing society and that the problems today are very different from those of the 1930's when these programs were inaugurated.

#### INCREASE IN ADC CASES

The number of needy persons receiving old-age assistance has been declining steadily as a result of the extended coverage and increased protection offered under the Social Security Act. On the other hand, public assistance programs for dependent children have grown rapidly in spite of the fact that the social security insurance system provides benefits for a large share of widowed mothers and children.

In 1940, the reasons for qualification for aid to dependent children were: death of a parent, 41.6 percent; and absence from the home, 30.3 percent. In 1960, these figures had been reversed to death of a parent, 9.6 percent; and absence from the home, 62.2 percent.

#### EFFECTS OF FAMILY BREAKUP

Family disorganization has become the major factor in the growth and size of public welfare programs. Family breakup through divorce, desertion, and separation, and the increase in illegitimate births have created serious public welfare problems. Hard core unemployment in many areas and the migration of unskilled farmworkers from rural areas to big cities have also added to the problem.

The primary responsibility, of course, is to provide support for the children when it is clearly established that neither parent is able to do so. In questioning witnesses concerning the administration of the program, emphasis is always placed on the welfare of the child, and properly so. It seems to me, however, that there is corresponding responsibility to be certain that the money is used each month for the support of the children.

#### MUST BE USED FOR CHILDREN

All of us agree that every possible effort should be made to permit the children to grow up in a home environment. It was for this very purpose that the aid to dependent children was inaugurated. We also know, however, that the fact of parenthood does not automatically confer a sense of responsibility and that funds intended for the support of the children are not always used for this purpose.

The problems are obviously deeper than mere support of the dependent chil-

dren. It is also clear that welfare checks do not solve these problems. In some cases, they may actually add to them. Unless there is a major reorientation of public welfare programs away from the dole and toward constructive services, the size and cost of the programs will increase year by year at every level of government and they will eventually collapse of their own weight.

#### NEW APPROACH OFFERS HOPE

The public welfare amendments of 1962, recently passed by the House, are an attempt to correct this situation. The new approach places emphasis on the provision of services to help families become self-supporting rather than dependent upon welfare checks. The bill also provides broader authority to the States to permit great flexibility in taking action against abuses.

The success of this effort to redirect our welfare programs will depend in good measure on the administration at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Relaxation of Federal controls and encouragement of greater flexibility in State programs place greater responsibility on State administrators. We can only hope that this is the beginning of a concentrated effort at every level to direct public welfare programs away from relief and toward rehabilitation.

#### PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Turning to the Office of Education, Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment briefly on the reference in our report to payments to school districts in the area immediately surrounding Washington, D.C. For some years, there have been proposals to change the basic law in such a way as to make reasonable adjustments in these payments. Despite the merits of these suggestions, no action has been taken by the Congress. In order to keep faith with the schools deserving of this assistance, we have no alternative but to provide the full \$282,322,000 required to meet 100 percent of entitlements for 1963.

Public Laws 815 and 874, the so-called impacted areas bills, were passed in recognition of Federal responsibility to school districts clearly faced with an added burden as a direct result of Federal activity which increased school population while reducing local tax income. When the problem is created or aggravated by the Federal Government, justice demands that the Federal Government accept responsibility for assisting parents and local communities in providing for the education of their children.

#### HELP OR HINDRANCE?

I do not think it was ever the intention of Congress that fulfillment of this serious Federal responsibility should result in a windfall for the nearby counties in the District of Columbia area. Has the employment offered by the Federal Government in this area reduced the sources of tax revenue? Has it decreased the tax base? These are the questions that must be answered in justification of Federal aid to these school districts.

I can assure you that there are many communities in the Nation and many in

the State of Minnesota that would welcome the employment opportunities at the salary levels available in this area without demanding still further handouts from the Treasury.

#### COMPARISON OF PER CAPITA INCOME

A comparison of the 1959 per capita income figures, the most recent available from the Bureau of the Census, clearly indicates that military and governmental activity in many areas tends to improve income. Although no figures are available for 1962, it is certainly to be expected that per capita income has improved in California and in the nearby suburban areas of Washington. Even if there has been a comparable increase in Minnesota, the spread is worth noting when we talk about the alleged hardship Federal employment has caused for areas of California and for suburban Washington.

The Bureau of Census figures for 1959 on per capita income are as follows: Minnesota, \$1,733; California, \$2,308. The comparable figures for the nearby cities and counties are: Montgomery County, Md., \$2,949; Prince Georges County, Md. \$2,151; Arlington County, Va., \$3,056; Fairfax County, Va., \$2,390; and Alexandria, Va., \$2,500.

The implications do not need elaboration, but the figures hardly indicate that large-scale Government employment impairs the ability of citizens to support their schools.

#### AREA SCHOOL PAYMENTS

The following tables show the extent of Federal expenditures for school purposes in the metropolitan area:

*Actual and estimated entitlements under Public Law 874 of school districts in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963 (as of Feb. 21, 1962)*

School district	Fiscal year 1961 actual	Fiscal year 1962 estimated <sup>1</sup>	Fiscal year 1963 estimated <sup>2</sup>
Montgomery County, Md.	\$2,453,290	\$2,596,870	\$2,594,435
Prince Georges County, Md.	2,276,300	2,411,850	2,411,810
Alexandria City, Va.	651,220	650,495	649,580
Arlington County, Va.	1,531,835	1,562,615	1,563,235
Fairfax County, Va.	3,635,914	3,678,150	3,677,590
Falls Church City, Va.	115,221	99,530	99,405
Fairfax City, Va.	-----	189,508	189,201

<sup>1</sup> Estimates; 92 percent of full entitlement.

<sup>2</sup> Estimates; 81 percent of full entitlement.

*Summary of construction aid under Public Law 815 of school districts in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963 (as of Feb. 21, 1962)*

School district	Fiscal year 1961 actual	Fiscal year 1962 estimated <sup>1</sup>	Fiscal year 1963 estimated <sup>1</sup>
Montgomery County, Md.	-----	\$545,928	\$1,000,000
Prince Georges County, Md.	-----	-----	2,000,000
Alexandria City, Va.	-----	-----	-----
Arlington County, Va.	-----	-----	-----
Fairfax County, Va.	-----	900,000	1,545,970
Falls Church City, Va.	-----	-----	-----
Fairfax City, Va.	-----	248,480	-----

<sup>1</sup> Estimates based upon data submitted by applicant adjusted by a reduction factor; application not processed by Office of Education as of Feb. 21, 1962.

## PRESIDENT ASKS CUTBACK

The President has recommended a cutback in the rate of payment in these areas. These proposals are still before the legislative committees of the House and Senate which have primary jurisdiction over the matter. The law, as originally enacted in 1950, excluded the surrounding suburban areas by limiting entitlement to children whose parents were employed within the State of the impacted school districts.

Because of problems arising at military installations where parents of federally connected children crossed State lines for employment in an adjoining community, remedial language was included in the 1953 appropriation bill. It was obviously intended to deal with particular problems on a limited scale, but when the provision was written into the basic law in the next year, it opened the gates to the surrounding area. To permit this costly mistake to continue is a potential threat to the program itself and a disservice to the schools actually deserving of more assistance under the intent of the law.

## STRENGTHEN STATISTICAL SERVICES

In considering salaries and expenses for the Office of Education, the committee again emphasizes the importance of strengthening educational statistics and expresses a strong desire that primary attention be directed to this area. Anyone familiar with the hodgepodge of conflicting, inadequate, and inaccurate statistics upon which Congress has frequently been asked to base policy decisions will share in this sentiment.

The Office of Education was created to collect meaningful statistics which would aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems. Too often this major purpose has been relegated to the status of a fringe activity with the result that the statistics are useless to school administrators and to the Congress.

## SCHOOL BOARD COOPERATION

During our questioning, we were also assured that greater efforts will be made to cooperate more closely with local school boards, the elected officials who accept primary responsibility in the name of parents in the operation of our schools. These are, after all, the men and women most intimately concerned with the increasingly serious problems of school support.

To ignore them is to do real violence to the principle of local control, a principle to which even the most ardent advocate of Federal programs pays recognition.

## A BALANCED BILL

Although it has been possible to discuss only a few of the many facets of the bill before us, I would recommend that any member or citizen interested in more detailed discussion of these and other programs examine the record of our hearings. The statements of witnesses and the questioning by members are an indication of the thorough job done by the subcommittee. The fact that our recommendations have been accepted unanimously by the full Committee on Appropriations is another meas-

ure of our efforts to bring an acceptable bill before you.

I commend the bill to the House as a reasonable measure which attempts to strike a proper balance between needs and the resources available.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make several points here which I think should be brought to the attention of the House.

As far as the Office of Education is concerned, it is noteworthy that on April 1 of this year we are to have a complete reorganization of that body. Last year at this time, in April of 1961, the Office of Education produced a document known as "A Federal Education Agency of the Future." At that time they cited in their 56-page report the particular needs for Federal participation in various areas of local education. That document recommended a review of teacher preparation, curriculum, textbooks—in other words, the complete gamut of the educational operation.

We now see a broad step in that direction. Commissioner McMurrin testifying before the subcommittee made the following statement, and I would like to quote this, because while they do not call for funds in this bill it is obvious they are readying their bureaucratic machine for the onslaught.

Speaking before the Appropriation Subcommittee, Commissioner McMurrin said:

In reciting briefly some of the activities of the Office I wish by no means to convey the impression that what we are doing is sufficient or complete when judged by the requirements of our times. Quite the contrary is true, since our contributions and services in many cases underscore more and broader needs than those we are meeting and our progress frequently points to new measures of assistance that are essential to upgrade education. Our difficulties now quite frankly stem from fragmented approaches in many cases dictated by tradition or the specificity of authorizations which sharply limit the scope of our functions.

He goes on to outline a brand new plan of reorganization calling for the establishment of three major bureaus within the Office of Education, specifically the Bureau of Research, the Bureau of International Education, and the Bureau for Educational Assistance.

Make no mistake about it, the plans are well laid to launch the Office of Education into a brand new effort to bring about Federal aid to education and more power and more participation of the Federal Government in our local school districts.

Dr. Homer Babbidge, until recently associated with the Office of Education, also spoke before the subcommittee in support of the appropriation. He said:

The chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor has recently indicated that total Federal expenditures affecting education now run to some \$2.5 billion per year and he has asked a subcommittee to undertake a thorough canvass of these programs.

The plain fact of the matter is that we don't know how much Federal money is being spent in schools and colleges or what

practices and policies characterize these programs. As a consequence, we do not have a clear picture of what they are accomplishing, whether it be good or bad. In higher education, there seems to be widespread agreement that the net effect of existing Federal programs is good, but that the unevenness of Federal programs and the inconsistencies that derive from scattered responsibility are potentially troublesome matters.

The pattern of congressional responsibility for higher education is as unclear to most people as the pattern of executive responsibility. We now have some 46 separate agencies of the executive branch administering programs that affect higher education, and in the House of Representatives we have at least a dozen different committees that pass judgment on essentially educational legislation and appropriations thereunder.

One of the statements that Dr. Babbidge made, I thought to be rather humorous. I know the gentlemen on the committee have endeavored to do something about it in section 904 of this bill. It is the following:

One of the great values of a strong Federal educational agency would be its ability to withstand the claims of special interest groups.

But what has happened? We see the National Education Association and many other groups who are pushing the idea of Federal aid to education becoming the major beneficiary in these Federal educational grants. The Committee on Education and Labor in its hearings of last summer showed where a great amount of this grant money is going. You will find it goes to many of the groups and associations who lobbied for this bill. The National Education Association comes in for the lion's share. These groups are all lobbying for more aid to education, for more involvement of the Federal Government.

It is rather interesting because you gentlemen in section 904 evidently have faced up to this problem, but in doing a little bit of investigation on my own I think probably the amendment should be more extensive than you have it, because on page 149 of our hearings of last summer, for example, you show a grant of \$243,272 to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Department of Audio-Visual Instruction. Now, that group is not registered with the House as a lobbyist. I have checked it. It is listed in the telephone book, however, at 1201 16th Street, telephone AD 4-4848.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Well, that particular organization, I think, happens to be part of the National Education Association.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is the very point. When I called them up they said, "National Education Association," but they would not, it is my understanding, come under section 904. Further checking you see the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction. They are not registered with the House.

Mr. LAIRD. Is that not also a part of the National Education Association?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes, but they do not list it that way in their grant.

Mr. LAIRD. It is not listed as a department?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The NEA is separate, and these are all separate entities that receive grants under title VII that would not be subject to your amendment. Audiovisual instruction—I could not find where this agency was, so I called the NEA, and I said, "Could I have the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction?" The grant shows the name of Anna L. Hyer. So when the secretary answered, I asked for Anna L. Hyer. The lady said she was up in New Jersey attending a convention.

The Modern Language Association comes in for a sizable number of grants. All of these organizations are the very ones that are coming before the Congress consistently asking for more Federal funds and then they are receiving the major grants. I think the committee is to be commended in taking a step in the right direction to see that those lobbying before the Congress are not receiving awards and research grants under this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee sort of snowed some of us under this year with five volumes of hearings. That makes a pretty heavy weekend of work, and I did not get the hearings read as well as I should.

We have had some discussion of appropriations for behavioral studies. I wonder if there is anything in the hearings relative to a previous expenditure of some \$89,000 for a study of behavioral cocktail parties? Did the committee by any chance get a report on what happened to this study?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we were very pleased that the gentleman brought this matter to our attention. We immediately took this up with the Public Health Service, and I understand the project has been discontinued.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is the report available, does the gentleman know?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, there was no report made. It was discontinued, perhaps as a result of your calling attention to it, anyway the NIH admitted it turned out to be a rather poor project.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I appreciate that. Now, while the gentleman is on his feet, I wonder if there has been any report available on another subject. I believe there was an original grant of some \$33,000 to an institution or individual in Israel for a study of the intrapersonal, inter-personal relationship of husband and wife. Has there been any report on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have a preliminary report and we have been told by some of the best psychiatrists in the country that this is one of the really

good projects going, in the world now, in the field of psychiatry.

Mr. GROSS. When the full report is made and when the gentleman from Rhode Island receives it—when it is snowing or raining or something and we do not have anything else to do—I would like to sit down and discuss the importance of this report with the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman would not want to go to Israel to take a look at it?

Mr. GROSS. No; I would not care to do that. I can save the taxpayers money by reading the report.

Mr. Chairman, I understand there is some \$50 million in the bill above the spending of last year for impacted schools. Is that approximately correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield further, there is \$59 million more than has been appropriated for 1962, thus far.

Mr. GROSS. Over and above the spending for the same purpose last year; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman tell me why this has been increased by \$59 million?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield further, because of the formula that Congress voted last year, and because of the defense activities in these areas which make these areas eligible to receive this aid. We have nothing to do with that on the Appropriations Committee. When the Congress votes the authorization, we follow the formula, and that is the way it came out.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that some of these defense installations are being phased out and closed?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, some are being phased out, and some are being increased. We are spending more in defense this year than we spent last year, and we are going to spend more next year. I think it is going to increase instead of decreasing.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Iowa has made reference to the increase in spending this year over last year. May I point out to the gentleman that this bill carries \$50,029,000 more than the budget estimate for this year. And the committee has gone over the budget estimate by \$8 million in construction.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, that is right.

Mr. BOW. This is not only over what they spent last year, this is over and above the budget request?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. We gave them just what they were entitled to, and not one dime more. As long as this program is authorized by Congress, I hope that the Appropriations Com-

mittee will keep its word to these school districts and appropriate 100 percent of what Congress has said they are entitled to.

Mr. GROSS. In the gentleman's hearings I noticed a good many pages of grants to foreign universities for research projects.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, which ones is the gentleman referring to now?

Mr. GROSS. International grants.

Mr. FOGARTY. Are they in the Public Law 480 funds?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what funds are used, but they are in your hearings, and there is a long list of them. Why are we spending this kind of money in so-called developed countries which have money, and whose prosperity is greater than our own at the present time? Why are we spending this kind of money on research grants in many of these countries?

Mr. FOGARTY. This has nothing to do with foreign aid. This is research.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it is a form of foreign aid.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think they are spending half enough. I think we ought to double this, because we have some real good investigators and scientists in foreign countries who can help you and me stay on this earth a little while longer. The reason that many of us are alive today is because of the research carried on in some foreign country.

Mr. GROSS. Is there nothing reciprocal in the exchange of information? Why should we attempt to finance research all over the world for almost every purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield further; yes, there is reciprocity. We get the results of their investigations, as they get the results of our research. It is one of the best programs we have, and I think it is one of the best ways of making friends. I think it is better than the foreign aid program.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it may be better than the foreign aid program, but we also have the foreign aid program and apparently it is going to continue until it bankrupts this country or helps bankrupt it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I will say to the gentleman that this is discussed on page 88 of the hearings at which point we went into the consideration of the economics of the countries receiving medical research grants. I think the gentleman will note that I pressed the Director of the National Institutes of Health very strongly on this particular point, because it seemed to me that in many areas they were giving grants to countries that were perfectly well able to finance this kind of work themselves.

Mr. GROSS. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield further, the Director of the National Institutes of Health has stated that this whole policy will be reviewed



and that consideration will be given to discontinuing these grants.

I would like the gentleman to read the testimony on pages 88 and 89, where I went into this thoroughly.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. And while the gentleman is on his feet I am curious to know about this. Beginning on page 1574 of the hearings, Part III, there is a long list of applicants. These are with reference to grants to universities in this country. This says "applicant, type of institution," and then the heading is "Discipline." I am curious to know what discipline means in this connection.

Mr. LAIRD. These are fields of medical science. They are referred to as "discipline." I think it would have been better if the heading had been "Fields of Medical Science," or "Fields of Medical Specialties." That is what it means.

Mr. GROSS. I am just curious to know what the word means. Is it a medical term, or what is it?

Mr. LAIRD. It is generally used in medicine. It is a specific field of study.

Mr. GROSS. The United States has had nutritional teams going out at the rate of \$75 and \$100 per diem, plus expenses, to a number of countries over the world. What benefit has come to us from the studies that these nutritional teams and their staffs have made in all these countries, some of them underdeveloped, some of them developed countries?

Mr. LAIRD. I think we have had a little bit too much of that, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa. Expenditures for foreign travel do not have the kind of controls that I believe are necessary. I went into that in the hearings, also and discussed it at some length. I think we are spending too much money in that area. I tried to develop that very thoroughly in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin say that we are spending too much money in this field and I hope it will be ended promptly.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this bill will put some 5,400 more individuals on the payroll and increase the Federal aid to education by millions of dollars above even the budget figures, I cannot support the bill in its present form. I am certainly not opposed to research in the afflictions that beset humans but this bill goes beyond reason and into too many other fields. It is not within the capacity of the American taxpayer to continue many of these programs in the amounts for which appropriations have been made and are being proposed here today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES BENNETT, in regards to the Yerkes Primate Laboratory at Orange Park, Fla. This great laboratory should be kept

where it is. Federal funds should not be used to move it. The climate, facilities, and the cooperation of the local community have made possible the great work of this institution. The University of Florida has a close working association with the laboratory at Orange Park, and the research conducted there has been of national significance.

The Yerkes Laboratory has been vital to the economic life of Orange Park, Fla., for many years. This fine community is united in its determination to do everything possible to keep this great facility. They deserve the right to keep it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

[Mr. WICKERSHAM addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

(Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 10904, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1963; I rise, too, Mr. Chairman, to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and members of his subcommittee for the fine job that they have done on this bill and for the fine job that they do year after year as they bring this annual Labor-HEW appropriations bill to the House.

I find the work of this subcommittee is always scholarly and factual.

As the author of a substantial portion of the legislation funded by this bill, I would like to comment upon certain aspects of the bill. I was glad to see that the committee forcefully and correctly stated on page 7 of the report, with reference to the Rural Library Services Act that "This program has developed into one of the best programs of the Federal Government." The bill carries \$7½ million for the library program which is the total amount authorized for this year. This is a far cry from the day in 1950, when we failed to pass the Library Services Act by a record vote in the House.

It is a far cry from the early years of the act when we could almost never get anything like the full authorized appropriations. Yet, the rural library services program has, in fact, developed into one of the best programs of the Federal Government, and it is one that the House of Representatives itself can be proud of. Library programs in the Nation are, of course, growing and I agree with the committee that it is now time that the legislative committee look into the needed library situations that exist in other areas all around the country. I, myself, was very surprised to learn just a few years ago that library facilities in American junior and elementary schools are almost nonexistent. There is much that yet needs to be done

in connection with providing books for the American people. I often like to think that man has built nothing that has outlived books. When television came on 10 or 15 years ago, there were many who said that television would supplant the use of the library. Such is not the case. The American people are using their libraries much more now than they did 10 or even 5 years ago.

I have always supported and worked for vocational education, and I am happy to see that this bill increases the practical nurses training program from \$4 million to \$5 million, which is the maximum amount authorized by the basic legislation and thereby adds \$1 million to the overall appropriation for vocational education for this year.

The bill before us includes about \$230 million for educational activities under the National Defense Education Act and among other things adds about \$15 million to the amount appropriated for loans for college students. This student loan program has been eminently successful. Just a few days ago, it was called to my attention that a study had been made of 30,246 borrowers, and the study found that in about 90 percent of the instances the loans to students of ability and ambition had meant the difference of whether or not they could obtain a college education. I am happy to note that the committee took note of the fact that eminent witnesses before the committee stated that the National Defense Education Act "has contributed more to education in this Nation than any other recently enacted program."

The bill also carries funds for the expansion of teaching in the education of our mentally retarded children and expansion of teaching in the education of the deaf and an increase of about \$8½ million for grants to the States, on a matching basis, for rehabilitating the physically and mentally handicapped people of America. As one of the authors of Public Law 565 in 1955, I am proud to see that we as a nation are proceeding to our goal of doubling the number of people who can be rehabilitated to employment. My recollection is that in the year 1955, we were rehabilitating 60,000 in this country. With the money provided by this bill, it is estimated that in the year 1963 we will rehabilitate about 110,000. This is a program in which the Government receives approximately \$10 in return for every \$1 spent on the program itself. There are other programs with which I have been closely associated that are included in this bill.

I again want to congratulate the committee on the fine job it has done. This very afternoon the Alabama League of Municipalities is meeting in Mobile, Ala., and I was one of the speakers invited to attend that meeting. I wanted very badly to be in Mobile, but my deep concern for these programs with which I have been so closely connected throughout my congressional service impelled me to be here this afternoon and to make this statement about them, and in their behalf.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTEL].

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, in reading the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation hearings I have been intrigued by some of the inconsistencies that have occurred here in the past month. At the outset I want to congratulate the able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. LAIRD], for the outstanding job they have done in cross-examining representatives of the Executive.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the subcommittee's ranking minority member a question. In reading the hearings I find that the chairman questioned Secretary Ribicoff in regard to a directive by the President of the United States last October. As a result of that directive, the Department reserved certain funds that were passed by the Congress in last year's budget. The administration asked the Department to set aside and not spend \$116 million of its appropriated budgetary funds. A good portion of this money came from the Food and Drug Administration.

In addition, it is my understanding that last year the other body reduced the budget for this particular agency by \$500,000. In the questioning, Mr. FOGARTY said:

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Secretary, I think we ought to be spending \$100 million instead of \$28 million. I think they could and should grow at a faster pace. But you even cut them back \$500,000 in 1962. That makes it all the more difficult.

Secretary RIBICOFF. Of course, we try to plan these things out on a 5-year basis. There is a sense of reality that we have to work with and we work with the Budget Bureau in trying to accomplish this, and anticipating what the problems are. We try to develop an overall budget.

Taking into account the entire budget, I think the President has treated the Department fairly well overall.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just don't happen to agree with the President on this. You have held in reserves \$500,000-odd and the Senate had already cut it over \$500,000. That was a big blow to the enforcement of the food and drug laws when we ought to be expanding instead of going the other way.

Just consider the cost of medical quackery to the Nation. I think we could spend five times the amount of money on this type of work, and it would save untold millions of dollars to people who are being sold worthless things by quacks. I think we will get more money back than we spend.

I think it was only 2 or 3 weeks ago that the President of the United States sent a message to the House of Representatives and used these very words almost verbatim in asking for an accelerated program for food, drug, and cosmetic law enforcement in this country. I am a bit confused. I would like to have the minority member of the committee tell me and tell the House what has transpired here. Why did the administration in October of last year ask that this money be reserved? As a result, it was not spent and, yet, 4 weeks ago the administration came here and said that there was a desperate need in

this country to protect the citizens against medical quackery and impossible drug claims. Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. LAIRD. The question the gentleman propounds is a rather difficult one to answer. It is hard for me to explain the position of the administration on this particular item. It is true that the amount of money which we made available last year was below the budget estimate of the administration because the other body cut \$1,500,000 from the Food and Drug Administration. In conference, we resolved this difference and came up with a figure which was \$500,000 below the amount that was asked for in the original budget. The House had appropriated the full amount. Now the President has frozen for the Food and Drug Administration in the area of salaries and expenses a total of \$903,000 in the fiscal year 1962. It seems to me it is about time we started looking at actions and comparing those actions with the words because we have had a lot of words, but we have not had any action. I think this is a very good case in point, and I believe the administration made a serious mistake in not following through with actions and in simply relying only on words in the area of the food and drug law enforcement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is quoting just what I said in the RECORD and with due deference to the Secretary, I would like to point out that on yesterday \$272,000 was released by the administration for the Food and Drug Administration which will allow them to hire 58 additional persons between now and June 30.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the gentleman, however, that the figure which I used took into consideration the release the day before this bill was coming up, and that has to do with the \$243,000. But the figure which I used of \$903,000 took into consideration the release of yesterday.

Mr. CONTE. That is right. The overall figure was \$1,146,000.

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct and the reserve as of this very minute is \$903,000.

Mr. CONTE. And I think this holding back of \$1,146,000 has worked to the detriment of the citizens of the United States.

Let me refer to the President's message, where it was said that:

We need this because we are going to have to strengthen factory inspection authority of the Food and Drug Administration.

I ask the administration: How are you going to strengthen factory inspection throughout the Food and Drug Administration if you insist on a reserve of \$1,146,000?

Second, require new drugs and therapeutic devices be proved effective as well as safe. How can you prove new drugs and therapeutic devices to be effective as well as safe if you are asking that particular Agency not to spend \$1,146,000 of its operating funds.

Third, require cosmetics be proved safe before marketing. There again this program is jeopardized because the administration asks the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to reserve \$1,146,000.

Fourth, increased ability to stop illicit sale of barbiturates and habit-forming stimulant drugs. Again I ask, how can this be done if you are asking the Secretary to withhold from his enforcement program \$1,146,000?

I ask what fairness there is in your asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold funds because your budget is in trouble, and then come up here and cover up with a message such as was sent to us a short time ago? I just hope it will not happen again.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during the time I have served on this subcommittee we have had very pleasant associations with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. This is the last time Mr. MARSHALL will be serving on this subcommittee as we bring a bill to the floor of the House, since he decided not to seek reelection in the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota.

FRED MARSHALL has made a real contribution not only to the work of the House Committee on Appropriations but also to the entire House of Representatives. I consider him a very close personal friend for whom I have the highest regard and deepest admiration. FRED MARSHALL always spoke his mind in committee, letting the chips fall where they would on any issue. He spoke from the heart. He has made a particularly fine contribution to the work of the Indian health service and I feel that the influence he has had on the Indian health program in this country will be felt for a long time.

My hat is off to FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota. I regret that this is the last bill of this subcommittee we will bring to the floor of the House with him a member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the remarks of my colleague from Wisconsin concerning our colleague from Minnesota.

I take this time, however, for the purpose of asking a question. Am I correct in calculating that there are 5,000 new jobs funded in this bill over the level of last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is in the appropriation for Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. JONAS. The figure is 5,441 new jobs over last year. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. For the second time now in 2 weeks we have had appropriation bills in here funding thousands of new jobs over the levels in effect last year. Assuming that these 5,441 new jobs will cost in annual salary an aver-

age of \$5,000 a year, which is on the low side, it means we are adding \$27 million a year to the payroll costs for new Federal employees. We did the same thing last week in the Department of Interior appropriation bill when we increased the jobs in that department by 3,000 over the previous year, after having increased those jobs by 2,000 last year over the year before—an increase of personnel for the Department of Interior 5,000 jobs in just 2 years.

The record shows that in 1961 the Federal Government put on the payroll nearly 100,000 new employees at an annual payroll cost of nearly \$500 million a year.

I ask the members of the committee, How long are we going to continue to add to the Federal bureaucracy which already threatens to break the backs of the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and add to it that apparently he has not included the fringe benefits that go with those jobs.

Mr. JONAS. I am not counting government contributions to the health or retirement programs. I am counting nothing at all except the annual salaries. I for one believe that we have a big enough bureaucracy to run the Federal Government without continuing to add thousands a year to the Federal payroll.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to the gentleman the figures he uses are absolutely correct. The increases in this bill for the Social Security Administration alone are 1,748 new jobs, most of which are financed through the social security trust fund. In the area of the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service, there are 2,094 jobs.

May I also state that the money in this bill does not include all of the funding in the social security welfare program. For the fiscal year 1963 the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, about a week or two ago, reported to the floor of this House a bill for which we did not include the funds, which will add to this bill, over and above the budget estimate, a total of \$160 million. This came about by changing the rate in the lower sections of the welfare budgets from \$24.80 to \$29 of the first \$35 of State payments for old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the totally and permanently disabled, and so forth. This did not increase the benefit to any welfare recipient any place in the United States, but it will add to this bill in the Senate. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed that bill. But you are still going to have to add this amount.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for that contribution.

What I got up here to discuss, however, is the growing tendency on the part of the Congress to go along with the employees and even going beyond the administration in increasing Federal employees and even going beyond the administration's requests in some instances. After having added between 90,000 and 100,000 new employees to the Federal payroll in 1961, the new budget that is now under consideration would add another 46,000 Federal employees. The bill presently under consideration goes even beyond the requests made by the President and department heads and adds 420 new jobs above the budget.

Am I correct in that statement, I will ask the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will be delighted to answer the gentleman's question. I am sorry it is not more.

Mr. JONAS. I understand. All I want to know is if I am correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. Most of those are in St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. JONAS. Increases for new jobs are scattered throughout the bill and they add up to 5,441 new jobs and this is 420 more than the administration asked for. I am going to vote to recommit this bill in order that the subcommittee can take another look at this fantastic increase in jobs. I would hope that the new positions could be reduced substantially because the money could better be spent in eradicating disease and in expanded services than in adding so many new employees to the Federal payroll.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I think the RECORD ought to show the testimony which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gave before our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I asked this question when he was making a statement about the money that was appropriated last year. This is my question to him:

Do I understand that what Congress finally appropriated is not going to be spent? Either you asked for too much, or a curtailment that you have made now from the appropriated funds is not warranted.

Secretary RUSKOFF. We didn't ask for too much. I mean the House voted much more than we asked for. The Senate voted much more than the House voted, and then there was a conference committee report and there was a certain amount curtailed in the final result. But what was made available was still much more than the House voted, which was more than we originally felt could be effectively spent.

In other words, the question here is one of effectiveness. Money is important, but to me only money that is spent effectively is important.

Now, in addition to what we have here, our committee is considering this question of the training of physicians, dentists, and professional Public Health Service people, and I asked in our own committee whether the funds for this new project were in the budget and was told that the funds were there. I find now there is \$34 million, but our bill, if it is passed by the House, calls for \$134 million, so there will be \$100 million

more that will come into play if that measure is passed by the House, because our committee has already favorably reported H.R. 4999.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to first echo the sentiments expressed so eloquently and forcefully by our ranking Member, Mr. LAIRD, in his opening remarks. Mr. LAIRD is very knowledgeable on the subject matter at hand, is most searching in his interrogation of the witnesses, and a tireless worker on the subcommittee. I must say the same, of course, for our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], although I find myself in considerable disagreement with my chairman's views on many of the figures arrived at in this bill. While we are in disagreement on many of the issues philosophically, he is a most agreeable gentleman with whom to disagree.

I find myself, Mr. Chairman, in rather a perplexing situation on this subcommittee, for there are a number of enactments of the Congress which I have not supported at the authorizing stage but feel compelled to appropriate funds to implement the will of the Congress.

For example, just last week the Congress authorized a change in the formula for public welfare assistance grants to the States without my vote, but in a supplemental bill our Appropriations Committee will have to ante up the funds to implement this legislation.

Again, in the area of education I have taken a position unalterably opposed to Federal aid to education, and I find in this bill considerable sums going for education. The Federal scholarship program under the National Defense Education Act is approaching a quarter of a billion dollar figure at \$229,450,000. I did not support this legislative enactment. I have opposed several of the school construction measures coming before the Congress, and in this bill there is an item for \$63,686,000 for assistance for school construction. The only area of Federal aid to education which I have supported is payments in lieu of taxes to school districts in federally impacted areas. This bill, as has been said before, increases the budget figure by \$58 million to a total of \$282,322,000. I am opposed to this increase because of the formula which gives so much to the area immediately surrounding the city of Washington, D.C., and I must say again parenthetically that I, along with Mr. LAIRD, were only 2 out of a total of 30 Members of the House voting against this authorizing legislation a year or so ago.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other areas where a member on this subcommittee is in a tight squeeze; for who wants to be against eradication of cancer, tuberculosis, and the communicable diseases? All of us have compassion in our hearts for the crippled children and the disabled. I am deeply concerned

for those unfortunate people in our mental institutions, as well as those who are deaf and blind; and all the witnesses coming before our subcommittee make a good case for ever-increasing amounts to be appropriated to alleviate these conditions, but there is a limitation to the extent to which we can go.

There is an item in this bill in the amount of \$2,538,300,000 for grants to States for public assistance, and I should like to include at this point figures showing the growth of this program since 1936 taken from the social security bulletins issued through the year 1959, together with recent HEW testimony and estimates for 1962 and 1963.

*Growth of Federal grants for public assistance and child health and welfare*

Fiscal year ending June 30—	All programs	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children
1936	\$30,586,000	\$24,654,000	\$2,482,000
1937	149,896,000	124,585,000	14,789,000
1940	280,812,000	220,448,000	44,669,000
1945	420,675,000	345,738,000	60,127,000
1950	1,146,195,000	843,161,000	256,087,000
1955	1,455,856,000	920,358,000	387,000,000
1959	2,009,623,000	1,135,174,000	630,459,000
1962	2,503,700,000	1,269,900,000	865,500,000
1963	2,709,300,000	1,287,300,000	925,300,000

<sup>1</sup> Medical assistance for aged an added \$230,900,000, 1962; \$431,200,000, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee chairman has said that the report comes to the House unanimously, and I would say this is so with considerable reservation on my part. I am quite well aware that my position on many of these items is distinctly a minority view, and I will say to the credit of our subcommittee chairman that he has given in on a number of items to those of us on the subcommittee who felt that either the budget figures or the chairman's proposed figures were too high.

Mr. LAIRD pointed up in his opening remarks that the administration has held in reserve over \$100 million appropriated in this bill last year, and that in effect makes the members of this subcommittee appear as though we were delinquent in scrutinizing carefully the Department's requests last year. It is indeed embarrassing to those of us who felt last year's figures were too high, and there is no question in my mind but that holding these sums in reserve played a role in the final figures arrived at by the subcommittee when marking up this bill.

I certainly would not want to transgress upon the time of the House to air my differences of opinion on each and every item in the bill for it would serve no good purpose here this afternoon. Suffice it to say, the growth in this appropriation bill in the last several years concerns me greatly.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word about my good friend and colleague, FRED MARSHALL of Minnesota, who will be leaving the Congress at the end of this term. He not only has served with me on this subcommittee but also on the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations. We have made several investigative trips together, and I have always found him to be a kind, consid-

erate, amiable, and likable fellow. He is so conscientious and serious about his work, and we are going to miss a most valuable member of the Appropriations Committee. I am sure all of the Members of the House join me in this appraisal of our distinguished colleague; and we wish for him all the best of everything as he returns to his active pursuit of farming back in Minnesota.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his part in bringing this health, education, and welfare bill to the floor at this time, and particularly for helping to see to it that an increase was made in the appropriation for cancer research.

The scourge of cancer is universal, and the treatment for victims of this disease remained the same for almost 1,300 years. Until the discovery of the roentgen ray the three methods of therapy prescribed by Paulus of Aegae in the sixth century; namely catheterization, cauterization and surgery were employed almost everywhere.

Today modern methods of treatment are proving effective in curing cancer when discovered in its early stages and shows the value of intensified research.

All of us know that research alone will help to decrease the number of victims of this scourge—a scourge which is universal. One out of five people will learn of cancer directly or indirectly and about one out of twenty will die of it.

Research must continue if more progress is to be made against this universal enemy. The American Cancer Society is waging an all-out war by alerting the public to the importance of early recognition of the disease, and by conducting a widescale research program.

Throughout the country good people and good doctors are collaborating to help the people of thousands of communities combat the deadly effects of this illness when it is not identified early and treated properly.

The appropriation for the ensuing years should continue to be substantial if the right kind of job is to be done, and the ultimate goal achieved.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the House one valuable program being conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and contributions being made to it in my district. We are all aware of the need to further language teaching in this country at a time when world events are so pressing. The problem lies in two areas—the teaching of strange, exotic languages known to few here, and the general teaching of languages more commonly used in world affairs.

The National Defense Education Act made it possible to intensify this training. The American Council of Learned Societies identified the languages in which trained persons were most needed by government, business, industry and education, through preparation of a list of 83 such languages. This list was later expanded to more than 100.

The language development section of HEW turned to the Hartford Seminary Foundation, long engaged in the educa-

tion of missionaries, for experience in some of these tongues, particularly the African languages. Prof. William Wellmers produced a brief course in Gio, which is spoken by approximately 100,000 people in Liberia. Prof. Maurice Hohlfeld is doing a grammar of the Hausa language, principal tongue of Northern Nigeria and adjacent territories. The Department is now negotiating for a project initiated by Prof. William J. Samarin for a preparation of a grammar of Sango, which is the lingua franca of the Central African Republic.

In the case of general language instruction, the 1958 act authorized in title VI the preparation of new and advanced materials to train teachers. The Office of Education knew of the fine work being done in the Glastonbury public schools under a strong director of curriculum, Mary P. Thompson, who had been active in regional and national foreign language work and had successfully directed the preparation of teaching materials for the elementary schools.

The resulting contracts have produced new materials in French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, which have been put to use nationally with some 125,000 beginning pupils. Four levels of the materials will be produced to make possible an unbroken, 4-year sequence of study in the high schools. The so-called "Glastonbury materials" are considered by National Defense Education Act administrators to be the most effective means yet found to improve the teaching in the schools and teacher training in the National Defense Education Act foreign language institutes.

Teachers, administrators, and pupils have been enthusiastic about this new approach to language teaching. With the use of records and tapes, this system is a welcome advance from the old conventional one-book method without adequate training aids. I think Congress should be aware of the improvements which its action brought about and of the splendid work done by the Glastonbury schools in meeting this challenge.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to very cordially compliment the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. FOGARTY, who has just submitted bill, H.R. 10904, with accompanying report making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

While there are other major points in this bill and report about which I would like to compliment Chairman FOGARTY and his committee for this unanimous report which accompanies the bill, at this time I especially compliment the committee on providing this House with a unanimous report which specifically sets forth action by the committee submitting for approval of this House, their unanimous recommendation in report contained that the school districts throughout our Nation, commonly designated as impacted school districts, shall get the estimated funds necessary to meet the full 100 percent of entitlement under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874.



On page 7 of the committee's report it specifies that the accompanying bill, H.R. 10904, includes the sum of \$282,322,000, which is an increase of \$50,029,000 over the budget request and which is the sum of \$51,029,000 more than the amount which was appropriated for 1962. And manifestly because the law relating to these impacted school districts has not been changed by Congress, it is fair and just and on all fours in the interest of taking the right steps, that the committee recommends this additional appropriation for 1963, for these impacted school districts so they may be able to plan their local school district obligations with the knowledge that they will receive funds to meet their full 100 percent of entitlement under the existing law.

I compliment the committee on including in its report, on page 8, the following language:

The committee is convinced that this program should be funded in accordance with the existing law in order to keep faith with the schools and has therefore included in the bill the exact amount that the Office of Education estimates will be required in 1963 to meet 100 percent of entitlements.

And furthermore, on page 8 of the committee report, the committee said as follows:

Assistance for school construction: The bill includes \$63,686,000, an increase of \$8,641,000 over the amount of the request, and \$8,836,000 over the amount appropriated for 1962. The same explanation applies to this item as was given in explanation of the immediate preceding item.

Mr. Chairman, the main reason I rise at this time to make these necessarily brief remarks, and to extend my sincere compliments to the distinguished chairman and all the other members of his hard-working subcommittee, is that in the great 23d District in Los Angeles County, which congressional district I represent in this great legislative body in this my 16th year of membership herein, is that there are several school boards in separate cities in my district which absolutely depend for their carrying out their full program for the year 1963 on a continuation of the funds called for in Public Laws 815 and 874. I have had communications from several school superintendents and school officials to this effect and they call my attention to the fact that their respective school district is still rightly classified and recognized as an impacted school district.

And, Mr. Chairman, also may I say that it is to be hoped that when the forthcoming deficiency appropriation bill is written up, or submitted to this legislative body for the year 1962, it also, I earnestly beseech, will provide the sums required for 1962 to meet 100 percent of their legal entitlement for 1962.

This full entitlement for the impacted school districts for 1962 and 1963 in the great 23d District is an absolute necessity.

I thank you.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my many other colleagues in the House in congratulating Chairman FOGARTY for the outstanding job he has done again this year on this appropriations bill. The people of the United

States owe a great debt of gratitude to JOHN FOGARTY for his unceasing effort to press for more research funds to eliminate the killing and crippling diseases of mankind. Thanks to him and to this committee, the National Institutes of Health stand as a symbol of the determination of the American people that cancer, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, and other scourges of mankind will soon be as extinct as smallpox, diphtheria, and scarlet fever.

I want to particularly commend the committee for its criticism of the Department in this year's bill in the field of mental health. It is lagging and it should be pushed to greater action. The Joint Commission on Mental Health was set up in 1955 to draft a comprehensive blueprint for treatment of the mentally ill. The Commission's recommendations have resulted in tremendous activity at State level, but unfortunately the current budget does not contain the funds necessary to carry out the Commission's recommendations at the national level. We desperately need psychiatric research. We desperately need to train needed psychiatric manpower. The problems in this field continue to mount, and we have not concentrated sufficient national strength to meet them.

My home State of Illinois is making a proud record in this field. Governor Otto Kerner has established a separate Department of Mental Health under the direction of Dr. Francis Gerty, distinguished past president of the American Psychiatric Association. This is one of the far reaching and beneficent actions taken in the field, and under Governor Kerner's sympathetic and knowledgeable leadership, Illinois has become one of the pioneering States in developing new methods of treating the mentally ill. Last year the Illinois General Assembly voted appropriations for six intensive treatment hospitals in various parts of the State. When they are completed the average mental patient will be not more than 1 hour from the nearest psychiatric facility.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot pass this opportunity, too, to recount what we have done for the Veterans' Administration medical research program in the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am a member. The VA medical research program has been increased from \$5 million in 1956 to approximately \$30 million for the current year. I am proud to have introduced the amendment in committee a few years ago to increase the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration's mental health program so that additional psychiatric technicians and skilled workers in the field could be hired to help the Veterans' Administration's mentally ill patient load. This has resulted in more than a 50 percent increase in the rate of discharge of mental patients from VA hospitals, patients who have been returned to their homes and normal life and to the activities of their communities. The VA program shows that there is a direct correlation between the amount of funds available for the care of mental patients and successful results achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I note, too, that the committee has taken action, too, in the field of geriatrics. This is as it should be, for the medical needs of our older citizens should command our continued attention. The fastest growing segment of our population is represented by people age 65 and over, and so much needs to be done to alleviate their pressing problems. Medical science has added years to our lives, but unfortunately, in too many cases the additional years have proved to be a burden rather than a blessing.

That is why I filed my bill last week, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10870, the Services to Older Persons Act. Under the bill, projects may be instituted which will help, as the bill states:

First. To assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

Second. To enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;

Third. To provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

Fourth. Older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years;

Fifth. To rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

Sixth. To assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;

Seventh. To assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and

Eighth. To relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.

Mr. Chairman, for these purposes the bill authorizes an expenditure of \$2 million on a one-third matching basis for a planning period so that States may explore and correlate their particular needs—a method which has proved its effectiveness in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, as well as in other similar legislation. And for the following 4 years, it authorizes grants to the States for approved projects of \$2 million for the first year, \$3 million for the second, \$4 million for the third, and \$5 million for the fourth, with a flat grant

of \$25,000 to each State. The balance of the Federal funds will be distributed in accordance with a weighted formula based on per capita income and the percentage of people 65 and over within the State. This method is in recognition both of the need for such projects and the ability of the State to finance them.

Also included in my proposal is an authorization of \$500,000 per year for similar research by private nonprofit institutions. Finally, the bill calls for a National Conference on Problems of Older People at the end of the 5-year period to report on the experience of the community projects and to make appropriate recommendations.

A newspaper article in Chicago's American the other night contained a report of an interview with Geriatrician Dr. Prescott W. Thompson of the Menninger Clinic. I quote what the reporter, Robert Peterson, said:

When I stopped at Dr. Thompson's office recently I asked what fears are particularly apparent among older people today.

"A leading one is the fear of helplessness," he replied. "Although only a small percent of all older people become fully dependent on others, this dull, throbbing fear of invalidism plagues many elders.

"We can help these people by reminding them that their chances of escaping helplessness are very good—provided they remain physically and mentally active."

What about the principal needs of older people—aside from health and income? "I'd say it's their need to feel useful and important. Many retired people wither largely because they have few chances to demonstrate their usefulness.

"Just about everyone, regardless of age, has potentials for useful service. We need to remind elders of this fact and to do what we can to create opportunities for them.

"Sometimes you'll find an older person who merely sits day after day and insists he doesn't want to do anything. In these cases we must try to understand the factors which stand in his way and use our powers of persuasion to spark his interest and get him to use such abilities as he has before he loses them.

"It's unfortunate," he concluded, "that many people still take the view that a person who has worked hard all his life should retire to a life of complete leisure. Although there is much to be said for taking things easier, the person who is accustomed to driving himself will find it difficult adjusting to leisure."

It's good to know that a clinic as important as Menninger's is taking an organized interest in aging. Although bidding the boss goodbye may loom as an easy, inviting prospect, scientists are finding that it's more of a trick than most folks realize to achieve a successful, well adjusted emotional life in retirement.

Similar conclusions were reached some years ago by research teams at the University of Chicago, and their findings were published in an issue of State Government. The authors, Ethel Shanas and Robert J. Havighurst, of the university's committee on human development, drew on some of the findings in reaching their conclusion that our society frequently fails to provide enough satisfying social roles for older people.

Most Americans like to be active, busy, and to have the feeling of accomplishment—

They wrote—

But old people are not expected to act this way. The American way has been to ignore old age—to act as if it did not exist, and to push it into the corner whenever it seeks to assert itself.

Old people, they find, need something to do. Their special health needs must be met; their special housing needs considered. Finally they said:

Old people, like other human beings, need to feel that they belong and are important to someone or something. Research evidence indicates that, with the decline of intimate human contact the personalities of old people deteriorate. \* \* \* Many cases of senile deterioration seem to be the result, not of organic changes, but of living in a social vacuum.

Public health officials are discovering that preventive measures are as important for persons growing old as for children growing up. They have developed a battery of tests—described as multiphasic screening—which can be given in from 15 to 30 minutes. They are inexpensive, and can be given on a mass basis by a small staff made up of nurses, technicians, and a clerk. Such checkups of persons over 45, given free in test areas throughout the country, have uncovered symptoms of high blood pressure, diabetes, anemia, heart disease, and tuberculosis which were unsuspected by the individuals. With proper treatment, the victims can usually continue for years to lead happy and useful lives. If these symptoms had lain unnoticed until serious damage had been done, they would be blamed on the effects of old age.

I am greatly concerned with this matter, Mr. Chairman, for all evidence shows that we are condemning too many of our senior citizens to a life of loneliness, neglect, and despair. A recent study points to the fact that many older people throughout the country have been stowed away and virtually forgotten in antiquated public infirmaries or in substandard nursing and convalescent homes.

Almost a century ago Benjamin Disraeli wrote in one of his novels:

Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair.

That is still our hope. The golden years can be glorious years if our older people have enough to live on, good housing accommodations, something to keep them active and to give them a feeling that they belong—that the community has not discarded them. We are still far from that goal, but it is one toward which we must strive.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that my bill provides the method which will encourage action where it is needed. It will encourage the kind of activities which are already in the planning stage in hundreds of communities throughout the country, but which cannot get off the ground because of a lack of sufficient funds. It will enable us to determine the kinds of projects which can truly benefit our senior citizens. It will provide an opportunity for the exchange of information between communities through

the Federal Government. And it will recognize, finally, that although the current problems of our older people are in the first instance the concern of the States, they are national problems as well.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my bill will soon be passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

To carry out the provisions of title VI of the Act, as amended, \$188,572,000, of which \$125,000,000 shall be for grants or loans for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,800,000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636, and \$60,000,000 shall be for grants or loans for facilities pursuant to part G, as follows: \$20,000,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$20,000,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$10,000,000 for rehabilitation facilities, and \$10,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That allotments under such parts C and G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein: *Provided further*, That funds made available under section 636 for experimental or demonstration construction or equipment projects shall not be used to pay in excess of two-thirds of the cost of such projects as determined by the Surgeon General.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN of New York: On page 25, line 21, immediately before the period insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this paragraph may be used for grants or loans for any hospital, facility, or nursing home established, or having separate facilities, for population groups ascertained on the basis of race, creed, or color".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman to support an amendment which would provide a limitation upon the appropriations for hospital construction activities: that is, relating to page 25 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prevent the use of funds appropriated under the Hill-Burton Act for hospital construction for segregated facilities.

The Hill-Burton program has provided Federal financing to help construct more than 2,000 medical care facilities in 11 Southern States. Since the inception of the Hill-Burton program these States have received \$562,921,000 for hospital construction. Authorities have pointed out that virtually all of these institutions discriminate in various ways against Negro citizens.

Patterns of discrimination may vary. For example, some hospitals bar Negro patients altogether. The New York Times on February 13, 1962, reported that, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 100 of the 4,000 Hill-Burton hospitals bar Ne-

groes. Others admit Negro patients, but segregate them within the hospital. One hospital in Georgia, for example, provides only 12 beds for Negro patients, and the beds are located in a segregated section of the hospital in the basement. This hospital also refuses to admit any Negro pediatric or maternity cases. In addition, many Southern hospitals refuse to allow Negro doctors to treat patients in the hospital, and discriminate against Negroes in their employment practices.

Recently, discriminatory practices in federally aided hospitals have been dramatized. On February 13, 1962, six Negro doctors and three Negro dentists and two Negroes in need of medical care filed a complaint in a Federal district court in Greensboro, N.C. The complaint alleged that discriminatory practices in hospitals violate the due process and equal protection clause of the fifth amendment. The court has been asked to issue an injunction prohibiting the defendants from—

Continuing to enforce the policy, practice, custom, and usage of denying admission to patients on the basis of race and in any way conditioning or abridging the admission to, and use of, the said facilities on the basis of race.

The pattern of discrimination may vary, Mr. Chairman, but there is abundant evidence that the results seldom do. The policy of "separate but equal" in our medical care system almost invariably results in the unequal or inadequate medical care for many American citizens. Equality must be more than a mere slogan. It must, if we are to be true to our democratic principles, be a reality.

I believe that the elimination of Federal expenditures for segregated facilities is long overdue and that it is time for the U.S. Congress to make clear that it does not condone racial segregation in our hospitals nor the practice of using taxpayer's money to support this doctrine. I hope that all the Members of this body will support this amendment and uphold the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

Civil rights is the great unfinished business facing America. It is the unfinished business of Congress. Of course, I do not mean to imply by my amendment that the executive branch is without power to act in this situation, but I do believe that Congress has a present responsibility. By adopting this simple amendment, we have the opportunity to strike down one area of discrimination. Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes—2 minutes to be allowed to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have been on this committee I have opposed legislation on appropriation bills. In my opinion, even though this is technically a limitation, this would have the effect of changing existing law, the so-called Hill-Burton Act. Therefore, I request that the amendment be voted down.

(Mr. KOWALSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

In 1944 as a member of the Eisenhower staff in the European theater, I prepared the initial study to provide for the integration of our Negro-American soldiers into the white fighting units. If the Negro was good enough to fight shoulder to shoulder with white American soldiers, he is now, it seems to me, entitled to integration as an American in our medical facilities. Accordingly, I feel a strong obligation to support this amendment.

I arise in support of the amendment.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report of 1961 points out that a total of 90 separate segregated facilities had been erected under the Hill-Burton Act through 1960. Seventy-one of these facilities with 4,514 beds have been for white, while 19 facilities and 1,221 beds have been for Negroes.

It is incredible to me that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continues to administer grants for segregated hospital and health care facilities 8 years after the Supreme Court decided, in the school segregation cases, that so-called separate but equal facilities are in direct contradiction to the principles of our Constitution.

The continuation of this pernicious discriminatory practice is nothing short of federally financed quackery jeopardizing the welfare and the lives of Negro citizens. This practice furthermore condones the abridgement of the rights of Negro doctors and dentists to practice their profession under the equal protection of the law. And it condones an abridgement of the right of Negro patients to be treated by their own doctors, who in many cases are denied staff privileges in Federally financed facilities.

Suit has been filed in the U.S. District Court of the Middle District of North Carolina alleging that the Wesley Long Hospital refuses to admit Negro patients. HEW has granted this hospital \$1,617,000 for new hospital construction, \$66,000 for additional service facilities, and \$265,000 for additions to the nursing home. In other words, nearly \$2 million of the taxpayer's money is being used to subsidize racial discrimination in this one instance.

Through fiscal 1962 a total of nearly \$2 billion has been appropriated for hospital construction. How much of this has been used to enforce racial discrimination? How much of it has been wasted through ridiculous duplication of facilities? And how much longer is this going to go on?

I submit that the present administration of Federal funds for construction of hospitals is Federal malpractice, wasteful of our health resources and the taxpayer's money, and worst of all it is a violation of the rights and welfare of the individual American.

If Congress does not see fit to condition these appropriations, then it is incumbent upon the administration to take Executive action.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for me at this time to make a point of order against the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has reserved his point of order. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island insist on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I waive the point of order. I have stated my reasons as to why the amendment should be defeated and I ask the committee to vote down the amendment.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for me to make a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, does not the point of order come too late?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is making a parliamentary inquiry at the present time.

Mr. YATES. I beg pardon.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time the gentleman from Rhode Island was recognized and I was on my feet for the purpose of making a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island being a member of the committee, the custom is that he be recognized first.

The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, has not the point of order been waived by the gentleman from Rhode Island speaking to the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Rhode Island was speaking to his point of order and insisted then on the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. YATES. That is correct, Mr. Chairman, and, therefore, no point of order is proper at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] now states he was on his feet attempting to press a point of order against the amendment, but the Chair had understood that the gentleman from Rhode Island did insist on his point of order. However, the Chair was in error as to that and the gentleman from Georgia is now recognized to make his point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, one final parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, does not the point of order by the gentleman from Georgia come too late?

The CHAIRMAN. Not under the circumstances. The Chair would assume there is a possibility of more than one point of order being made and for more than one reason.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BURLESON). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment to which a point of order has been made. The language of the amendment to which a point of order has been raised is as follows:

*Provided further,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this paragraph may be used for grants or loans for any hospital, facility, or nursing home established, or having separate facilities, for population groups ascertained on the basis of race, creed, or color.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a proper limitation under the rules of the House and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN), there were—ayes 28, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

For necessary expenses of carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 5, 1960 (74 Stat. 308), and for care and treatment in accordance with the Acts of March 2, 1929, and October 29, 1941, as amended (24 U.S.C. 191a, 196a), \$467,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, who are these repatriates that are being taken care of to the tune of nearly half a million dollars?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is mostly for those people who are suffering from some form of mental disease.

Mr. GROSS. Who are they? Are they of all nationalities that have come to this country?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; they are all American citizens.

Mr. GROSS. They are all American citizens?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Why are they called repatriates?

Mr. FOGARTY. Because they have been overseas and have come back to this country. They are people who do not have a family to take care of them. Somebody has to take care of them, so that is the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Is this what service overseas does to some people?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, it does, in a few instances.

Mr. GROSS. Another Member suggested the Peace Corps? This will take care of the Peace Corps, too, I assume?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not before our committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not had enough experience with it to know?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not before our committee. I do not know.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 205. Appropriations to the Public Health Service available for research grants pursuant to the Public Health Service Act shall also be available, on the same terms and conditions as apply to non-Federal institutions, for research grants to hospitals of the Service, and to Saint Elizabeths Hospital.

This title may be cited as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1963.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I will want to make a careful study of the decision of the Supreme Court on yesterday, March 26, in the Tennessee case before making a final assessment of it. But a few points appear to be clear from the newspaper accounts of the decision.

As Mr. Justice Harlan pointed out in his dissenting opinion, the decision is a break with the past.

Throughout the history of our Republic Congress, has followed a consistent policy of leaving redistricting problems up to the States. It is true that when as a result of a decennial census a State gains a seat in Congress, Congress has provided that the additional Member must be elected at large, and that when a State loses a seat all the Members in that State must be elected at large unless the legislature of the State affected provides a system of redistricting. But that is a far cry from Congress going in to the business of fixing the boundary limits of the congressional districts in the several States. On the contrary, Congress has always taken the position that it was better for the States to work out their own problems and to carve out their own congressional districts. And it never even occurred to Congress in the past that it should undertake to fix the geographical limits of the representatives in State legislatures. Yet, as pointed out by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion:

In effect, today's decision empowers the courts (mind you, the courts—not the Congress) of the country to devise what should constitute the proper composition of the legislatures of the 50 States.

It must be clearly understood, therefore, that the six judges who decided the Tennessee case were not passing judgment on an act of Congress. I am not saying that Congress has absolutely no power to pass a law on the subject of congressional apportionment and congressional districting. The point is that Congress very deliberately saw fit to re-

strain whatever powers it might have and to leave it up to the States themselves to decide congressional districting problems, let alone State and local districting problems.

And so, in spite of a long-standing congressional policy of not making law in this area, a majority of the court-made law by interpreting the Constitution in a different way than their predecessors. As Justice Frankfurter pointed out, "to find such a political conception legally enforceable in the broad and un-specific guarantee of equal protection is to rewrite the Constitution."

The Supreme Court did not undertake to say how this new system of apportionment and districting should be accomplished, but felt that it would be better for the district judges to fashion an appropriate decree in each case. That may be true, but since the Court did not set out standards and guideposts it may well result in as many systems as there are Federal district judges. No one can really say what might come next. Will the Federal Court stop at the level of State legislatures? Will they undertake to reapportion and redistrict city councils next? Will the composition of present State legislatures be disturbed? Will the terms of present State representatives and senators be cut short? What happens to State laws? Will new elections have to be held, and if so, under what rules and who will conduct them? If the Federal district judges in one State disagree, will there be more than one system in a particular State?

How will the decrees be enforced? Will the Court appoint special masters, and if so, to do what? Or will they use Federal marshals, and if so, to do what? What happens to the State election machinery? Will the decision put the Federal judges into politics, as Justice Frankfurter predicts it will?

I do not pretend to know the answers to these questions. In fact, no one can really know if, when, or how they may arise. That is the trouble with court-made law. That is the reason why whatever is wrong with State districting systems must be left to States themselves. Trying to do it by Federal court decrees will not work.

One thing is sure and that is that the decision will result in diminishing the influence of "country" representation and increasing the influence of "city" representation. Yet, just recently the House of Representatives refused to create a Department of Urban Affairs, to be headed by a Cabinet member. Does the decision have the effect of doing what Congress refused to do? The decision is bound to create tensions, irritations, and ill feelings.

For example, the following two sentences from an editorial appearing in this morning's—March 27—Washington Post may be a prediction of things to come:

For the moment it is enough to note the sweep of what the Court has done. To say the least, the decision opens up a new era in the struggle for the representation of people (rather than cows or acres) in the legislatures.



In these critical times, when we desperately need unity and harmony in fighting our common enemy—communism—this sort of biased and inflammatory editorial is, in my opinion, a disservice to our country.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman for his very fine and judicial statement about this important question. I would ask of him one question: Does this decision not indicate that we are on the threshold of having judicial dictatorship established in this country?

Mr. WILLIS. Well, there is a certain trend on the part of the Supreme Court in embarking in areas heretofore reserved to the States, especially in this matter of political decision.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether my bifocals deceive me or just what the situation, but as I read this bill, nowhere do I find any entertainment allowance in this \$5 billion bill. Am I unable to see the entertainment funds?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. We have \$5,000 here for the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. \$5,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. For the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare we have \$1,000.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently I did not read as closely as I should or between the lines. I thank the gentleman for his response.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 904. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be paid to any person or organization registered with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate under the Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 48, line 7, after the word "paid" insert: "for the purpose of conducting or assisting in conducting a research or demonstration project."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify section 904. As section 904 reads it would prohibit the use of any of these moneys to buy airline tickets, railroad tickets, and many other normal and regular costs. That was not the purpose of the section. It was merely to apply to the conduct of research projects and demonstration projects, and this is a clarifying amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House

with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURLESON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHANSEN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 10904 to the House Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 24, nays 371, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—24

Alger  
Anderson, Ill.  
Ashbrook  
Beermann  
Bruce  
Curtis, Mo.  
Devine  
Findley

Gathings  
Goodell  
Gross  
Hall  
Hiestand  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Johansen  
Jonas

Kearns  
Kilburn  
King, N.Y.  
Mason  
Roubush  
Rousslot  
Scherer  
Siler

NAYS—371

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Addabbo  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Alexander  
Alford

Andersen,  
Minn.  
Anfuso  
Arends  
Ashley  
Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Auchincloss

Avery  
Ayres  
Bailey  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Baring  
Barry  
Bass, N.H.

Bass, Tenn.  
Battin  
Becker  
Beckworth  
Belcher  
Bell  
Bennett, Fla.  
Berry  
Betts  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolton  
Bonner  
Bow  
Brademas  
Bray  
Breeding  
Brewster  
Bromwell  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brown  
Broyhill  
Buckley  
Burke, Ky.  
Burke, Mass.  
Burleson  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cahill  
Cannon  
Carey  
Casey  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Chamberlain  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chiperfield  
Church  
Clancy  
Clark  
Coad  
Cohelan  
Collier  
Conte  
Cook  
Cooley  
Corbett  
Corman  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Curtin  
Curtis, Mass.  
Daddario  
Dague  
Daniels  
Davis,  
James C.  
Davis, John W.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson  
Delaney  
Dent  
Denton  
Derounian  
Derwinski  
Dingell  
Dole  
Dominick  
Donohue  
Dooley  
Dorn  
Downing  
Doyle  
Dulski  
Durno  
Dwyer  
Edmondson  
Elliott  
Ellsworth  
Everett  
Evins  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Feighan  
Fenton  
Finnegan  
Fino  
Fisher  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Ford  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Gallagher  
Garland  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gavin  
Giaino  
Gilbert

Glenn  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Granahan  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Hagan, Ga.  
Hagen, Calif.  
Haley  
Halleck  
Halpern  
Hansen  
Harding  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Wyo.  
Harsha  
Harvey, Ind.  
Harvey, Mich.  
Hays  
Healey  
Hébert  
Hechler  
Hemphill  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Hoeyen  
Holifield  
Holland  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Hull  
Ichord, Mo.  
Inouye  
Jarman  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Joelson  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Md.  
Johnson, Wis.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kee  
Kelly  
Keogh  
Kilgore  
King, Calif.  
King, Utah  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Kornegay  
Kowalski  
Kunkel  
Kyl  
Laird  
Landrum  
Langen  
Lankford  
Latta  
Lennon  
Lesinski  
Libonati  
Lindsay  
Lipscomb  
Loser  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McDowell  
McFall  
McIntire  
McMillan  
McSweeney  
McVey  
Macdonald  
MacGregor  
Mack  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marshall  
Martin, Mass.  
Martin, Nebr.  
Mathias  
Matthews  
May  
Meador  
Michel  
Miller, Clem  
Miller,  
George P.  
Miller, N.Y.  
Milliken  
Mills  
Minshall  
Moeller  
Monagan  
Montoya

Moore  
Moorehead,  
Ohio  
Morgan  
Morris  
Morrison  
Morse  
Mosher  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy  
Murray  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Nix  
Norblad  
Nygaard  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N.Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski  
Olsen  
O'Neill  
Osmers  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patman  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Prest  
Philbin  
Pike  
Picher  
Pillion  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Poff  
Powell  
Price  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quie  
Randall  
Ray  
Reece  
Reifel  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riehlman  
Rivers, Alaska  
Roberts, Tex.  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Rutherford  
Ryan, Mich.  
Ryan, N.Y.  
St. George  
St. Germain  
Santangelo  
Saund  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Schenck  
Schneebeli  
Schweiker  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Scranton  
Seely-Brown  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Shipley  
Short  
Shriver  
Sibal  
Sisk  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Taber  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, Tex.

Thomson, Wis.	Vinson	Widnall
Thornberry	Waggonner	Williams
Toll	Wallhauser	Willis
Tollefson	Watts	Winstead
Trimble	Weaver	Wright
Tuck	Weis	Yates
Udall, Morris K.	Westland	Young
Ullman	Whalley	Younger
Utt	Wharton	Zablocki
Vanik	Whitener	Zelenko
Van Pelt	Whitten	
Van Zandt	Wickersham	

## NOT VOTING—41

Andrews	Grant	Peterson
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Bates	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers, S.C.
Bennett, Mich.	Huddleston	Roberts, Ala.
Blitch	Jones, Ala.	Seiden
Bolling	Keith	Sikes
Boykin	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Byrne, Pa.	Lane	Springer
Colmer	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Morrow	Tupper
Dowdy	Moorhead, Pa.	Walter
Fascell	Moulder	Wilson, Calif.
Flood	Norrell	Wilson, Ind.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Keith.  
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Tupper.  
 Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Wilson of California.  
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Morrow.  
 Mr. Lane with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
 Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Bates.  
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Springer.

Messrs. DOMINICK, NYGAARD, MacGREGOR, BELL, and UTT changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.